

# THE ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XIV.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER LXXXI.

SEPTEMBER, 1890

## CONTENTS

1. MODERN RECONSTRUCTION OF ETHICS. *Professor W. R. Benedict* . . . . . 13
2. THE POLARITY OF TRUTH. *Rev. James F. Brodie* . . . . . 125
3. SOCIALISM IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY. *Mr. George Willis Cooke* . . . . . 236
4. THE NEW BASIS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION. *Mr. George R. Stetson* . . . . . 254
5. MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM. *Professor L. Sears* . . . . . 260
6. THE HEBREW PROPHET AND THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER. *Geo. B. Spalding, D. D.* 280
7. EDITORIAL.
  - CARDINAL NEWMAN . . . . . 292
  - THE PRESENT TENDENCY IN THEOLOGY . . . . . 298
  - PROFESSOR HUXLEY, CANON LIDDON, AND "LUX MUNDI" . . . . . 304
8. LETTERS AND LIFE.
  - OPTIMISM IN AMERICAN LITERATURE AND LIFE. *Professor Charles F. Richardson* . 308
9. THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.
  - A GENERAL VIEW OF MISSIONS. SECOND SERIES. IX. CHINA. *Rev. C. C. Starbuck*. 310
10. GERMAN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. *Rev. Mattoon M. Curtis, M. A.* . . . 325

BOSTON  
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

*The Riverside Press, Cambridge*

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

D<sup>108</sup> Public Library 90\*2

"I advise all parents to have their boys and girls taught shorthand writing and typewriting. A stenographer who can typewrite his notes would be safer from poverty than a great Greek scholar." — CHARLES READE on "*The Coming Man*."

## REMINGTON STANDARD TYPEWRITER.



For Fifteen Years the Standard, and to-day the most perfect development of the writing machine, embodying the latest and highest achievements of inventive and mechanical skill. We add to the Remington every improvement that study and capital can secure.

WYCKOFF, SEAMANS & BENEDICT,  
NEW YORK.

## The Law of Equivalents in

*Its Relation to Political  
and Social Ethics.*

By

EDWARD PAYSON.



Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

*The object of this important work is to suggest to the American people that the methods of advance in the domains of matter and of morals are entirely unlike, and to recall the thought of America from its intense devotion to material pursuits and acquisitions to the far more important objects which demand attention in the realm of ethics and social life.*

From The Unitarian Review:

There is good material for thinking in this volume. . . The law of payment in kind . . . is unfolded with acuteness and helpful illustration. . . . The argument is generous, serious, and in the best sense ideal, — having in view a purer tone and a higher level of human life than now prevails. . . . And the elaborate comparison of what we mean by the life of the family with that of the state, the school, and the church, is dignified, comprehensive, and just.

Rev. Dr. Thomas Hill, former President of Harvard University:

Very few treatises could be named which would be better adapted to foster in the student the habit of wise deliberation and manly thoughtfulness.

For sale by all Booksellers. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price by the Publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY,

4 Park Street, Boston; 11 East 17th Street, New York.

nd-  
ect  
ma-  
and  
en-  
We  
im-  
ital

s to  
the  
nat-  
and  
its  
and  
ob-  
alm

. The  
ss and  
erious,  
ne and  
nd the  
family  
gnified,

arvard

better  
eration

ishers,





THE  
ANDOVER REVIEW:

A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. XIV.—SEPTEMBER, 1890.—No. LXXXI.

---

MODERN RECONSTRUCTIONS OF ETHICS.

OF these reconstructions there are three forms: one given by Mr. Darwin, one by Mr. Spencer, and one by Leslie Stephen.

I name the reconstructions forms because they are, in reality, but varying modes of the same undertaking, namely, to present ethics as a product of evolution.

That we may estimate this undertaking rightly it will be of service to consider what should be understood by ethics and what by evolution.

Science, it is said, deals with what is, history with what has been, ethics with what *ought to be*. This statement indicates obligation as the root-idea with which ethics has to deal. "You ought to love the Lord your God," that is, the *Best Being*, "with all your mind, might, and strength. You ought not to steal. You ought not to kill." In presence of obligation thus affirmatively and negatively stated, all ethical schools have divided into two broad classes, both schools, be it observed, concerned with an answer to the same question. The question is this, "*Why* ought I to love the Best Being? Why ought I not to steal or to kill?" The answers are noteworthy: "You ought to love the Best Being, because you ought." "You ought not to lie—to kill, because you ought not." The second answer, "You ought to love the Best Being because of consequences to yourself and others; these consequences being utility, happiness, or the welfare of the social tissue." "You ought not to steal or to kill because of consequences to yourself and others; these consequences being hindrance, pain, or weakening of the social tissue."

It is at once seen that, by one school, *no end* is given as the ground of obligation, while by the other there are stated the apparently varied ends of *utility, happiness, social welfare*.

The ethical side of our problem is, perhaps, not yet sufficiently distinct. What are we to understand by conscience for which evolution must give account or fail as an interpretation of man?

Permit me to say here what, doubtless, would have found a more fitting place at the beginning of this discussion. The space limits necessarily attaching to an article such as the present one, force many of my statements to a brevity and directness which will, I fear, give them the appearance of dogmatism. I can, however, honestly ask the reader to accept my assurance that I write in no dogmatic spirit, but, on the contrary, with much fear and trembling lest I conceal or mispresent the truth.

To return. What are we to understand by conscience? Conscience is the crystal-clear *knowledge* of a distinction between right and wrong, together with the *knowledge* of obligation to do the right and avoid the wrong. The perception of this distinction between right and wrong is, in its radical character, precisely like the perception of distinction between affirmative and negative, plus and minus, round and square.

It is important to observe, in this connection, that these mathematical distinctions cannot, in the first instance, be made, without direct, sensation experience of things greater or less, round or square. If one is blind from birth, and also without sense of touch, such distinctions cannot be known. Yet it nowise follows that when, under medical treatment, the sensations are restored and the distinctions made, they are produced by some psychical evolution from a consciousness where they did not and could not exist. In like manner the moral distinction, the distinction between right and wrong, is seen directly and instantaneously when certain courses of conduct appear. My language should not be taken to mean that conscience classifies *actions* as right or wrong; that conscience determines whether it is right to play cards or wrong to play cards, right to drink a glass of wine or wrong to drink a glass of wine.

The power to know *mathematically* does not determine whether a given building is perpendicular or inclined. If, by my own sight or the sight of another, I learn that the building has certain characteristics, I declare at once that it is inclined. If, by my own sight or that of church or party, I am led to believe that card playing and wine drinking have certain characteristics, I pronounce them wrong without a moment's delay.

Evolution, therefore, when dealing with ethics, has no concern with the diverse moral judgments of mankind ; it derives neither help nor hindrance from this long-admitted fact. I should not have thought it needful to emphasize this old-time misinterpretation of intuitional morality except for the fact that it appears with its old-time illustrations and claims in such an extended treatise as the "Principles of Morality," by Professor Fowler, of Oxford.

The question submitted by ethics to evolution is rather this : I see in this action a *right*, in that a *wrong* ; whence this seeing ? You see in that very same first action a *wrong*, in that very same second action a *right* ; whence this seeing — whence this common seeing, of a distinction between right and wrong ? In presence of these actions I choose the first and refrain from the second ; you choose the second and refrain from the first. Your conscience is at peace, so also is mine. Whence this common peace ?

I have thus emphasized conscience as containing the twofold moment of a clear perception of right and wrong and the equally clear recognition of constraint, of obligation. This it is with which evolution is concerned, and for which it must give account. Such conscience, be it observed, is not a theory, it is a fact. Among the noblest types of our civilization are men who live under exactly such moral guidance. Mistaken they may be, ignorant of the derivative character of conscience they may be, but they exist, and with them evolution must make full settlement.

Let us consider now, and in the second place, the meaning of this term "evolution." The word has a popular use that is vague, so much so as to be misleading. The hazy, every-day consciousness takes evolution to teach that man is descended from the monkey, which, of course, is quite too shocking. As, however, leading ministers and theologians, to say nothing of scientists (who may be supposed to stand in peculiar peril), "come out" evolutionists, the every-day consciousness begins to feel about for wherefores and therefores, to try, that is, to have an understanding with this subject. Evolution, most generally stated, means the production of the heterogeneous from the homogeneous. This impressive statement may be helped by a simple illustration. An egg, a grain, are structurally and functionally alike in all their parts. The egg does not contain, as was at one time believed, a miniature chicken, not even a microscopic chicken ; the grain does not contain the wheat shaft. By evolution, that is, by movement within their respective masses, the egg differentiates

into a chicken, the grain into a shaft of wheat. Note, for a moment, the essence of the idea; it is the production of the unlike from the alike, to phrase the matter inelegantly. The result, the chicken, is structurally and functionally unlike its source, the egg. I doubt not that such evolution as the chicken from the egg, the wheat shaft from the grain, we are all past doubting. Extending this idea of the production of the complex from the simple we reach that expression of evolution which may be called its scientific form, and which signifies that the present species of animals and plants are differentiations of simpler forms.

The evolution which nearly all reputable scientists regard as beyond question is the denial of special, creative acts for the innumerable species of plants and animals that everywhere abound. This evolution, I may say in passing, is not Darwinism — though Darwin believed it and aided to establish it by innumerable examples he was not its author. Darwinism is nothing more or less than one of the ways of accounting for, illustrating, the evolution thus indicated.

The problem was to know in what manner the simpler forms of animals and plants could be the occasions of the present astounding varieties. Mr. Darwin's doctrine of natural selection and survival of the fittest under struggle for existence is simply one of the answers to this question, — an answer which is generally rejected by men of science as inadequate. It would be foreign to the purpose of our paper to note the answers given by Mr. Mivart, or by Lamarck, a French naturalist of the beginning of the present century. Suffice it to say that there is a return to the views of the French writer, and this chiefly on the part of American scientists.

I have, as is seen, distinguished between evolution and attempts to account for or illustrate evolution. Before leaving this point I would discriminate also among those who accept evolution and would divide them into two classes, the logical and the illogical. I do this under conviction that the logic of evolution leads to the views of Mr. Spencer and Mr. Haeckel, according to which the present universe, with its definite modes of matter and its countless forms of life, evolved from an undifferentiated, nebulous, mass. This, I repeat, is the logic of evolution, and I do not believe that scientists who concern themselves wholly with matter can long resist the conclusion of their premises.

The extension of evolution as a method of Nature's working was inevitable. No supposed sacredness could withhold a subject

from the test of a method that had proved elsewhere so fruitful. A reconstruction of opinion was demanded all along the line, and the effects are, perhaps, most marked in psychology and in ethics. The design of the present paper (purposely more expository than critical) is to exhibit the doctrine of ethics arrived at by evolution, and proclaimed by the representative men already named, — Mr. Darwin, Mr. Spencer, and Mr. Leslie Stephen.

Without further prelude I quote from Mr. Darwin: "Any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, the parental and filial affections being here included, would inevitably acquire a moral sense as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well or nearly as well developed as in man." This passage plainly declares that conscience, as the clear discernment of a distinction between right and wrong, is a development from social instincts working under the guidance of reflection. Social instincts are admitted to be present in the lower animals; they are more pronounced in man, in whom there is the added power of reflection. Man can compare action with action, consequence with consequence, the momentary yielding to passion, whether of hunger or of hatred, with the ever-present social instincts. This comparison will give rise to a sense of shame, of self-reproach, and conscience will be developed.

Mr. Darwin's genesis of conscience is straightforward and natural, because it overlooks entirely the difficulty of the problem. These social instincts in the lower animals, as Mr. Darwin expressly teaches, have no moral character; they have no moral character even in our simian ancestors; they first acquire such character *in man*, and this solely because of his *larger* intelligence. I think Professor Schurman, of Cornell, right in saying that Mr. Darwin forsakes his method as a natural scientist when dealing with the ethical problem. As concerned with natural science, Mr. Darwin attempts no account of the origin of life or of primitive consciousness. He takes these as furnished, and traces their differentiation into the manifold forms of to-day. Not so does he deal with ethics. He professes not to find a trace of the moral anywhere below man; there is no ethical germ at the beginning of this evolution, and therefore the moral, when it does appear, must evolve from the non-moral. Such statement of the problem shows how utterly inadequate is Mr. Darwin's account of conscience or the moral knowing.

On the teaching before us there must have been a time when the most intelligent of our simian ancestors, or of men themselves,

first experienced the new feeling of remorse, of shame. In what way *reflection alone* could produce this feeling is not told us, and yet it is exactly such information that we demand. That beings *having no moral sense* should suddenly, or for the first time, pronounce their social instincts right when they clashed with personal desires is incredible.

Turn we to Mr. Spencer. Ethics is now presented as a division of biology, and its evolution is traced *as a special form of conduct*. Conduct is the purposed adjustment of acts to ends, and moral conduct is the highest expression of such adjustment.

Evolution, as an advance from the simple to the complex, necessarily has its conditions, and these will be commensurate with the stage of development already reached; a simple structure progressing in obedience to simple conditions, a complex structure in obedience to complex conditions. Human conduct, therefore, on its way to become moral cannot but present varied aspects commensurate with the relatively advanced stage reached by the primitive human being. In other words, conduct as evolving has a physical side, a biological side, a psychological side, a sociological side. Applying now to conduct as thus unfolding, the standard of excellence furnished by evolution, we learn that there is an ethical element or a *best* in each of the stages above enumerated. *Physically* speaking, conduct is moral in proportion to the complexity of its adjustments for the maintenance of physical well-being. Mr. Spencer expressly says that "a man's conduct is ethically better when it tends to a moving equilibrium between external and internal forces, between waste and corresponding repair." Here is suggested Mr. Courteny's interpretation of this teaching, namely, that a bachelor cannot be as moral as a father of a family, since his actions are much less heterogeneous, and further, that a man is moral in proportion as he is long lived.

Consider ethical conduct from its *biological* side. Here we are guided by our conception of life, and this conception, under evolution, can mean but one thing, namely, "the balanced maintenance of functions." Where these functions are complex, their balanced maintenance, as it is more difficult, so it is more advanced, and represents a higher, fuller life. This maintenance is progressively secured by the stimulus of pleasure and pain, because pleasure is the attendant upon, index of, functions *normally* active, and pain of those *abnormally* active. Man, therefore, is ethically obligated to follow the guidance of pleasure and pain. From maladjustments that were the inevitable results of changed physi-



cal and social conditions man does not now exhibit that balanced maintenance of functions where pleasure and pain *immediately* ensue upon normal and abnormal actions. Toward such a condition, however, man is being slowly yet surely led, and he will eventually reach "the completely adjusted social state where right actions will be immediately pleasurable and wrong ones immediately painful."

Pass to ethics *psychologically* considered. Here we meet the stress of our general problem as noted in an earlier part of this paper. Conscience, that is, the perception of a radical distinction between right and wrong and the experience of remorse, must receive an adequate genesis. Evolution dealing with this problem requires that we shall consider life *psychologically*. Doing so we find life to mean "the adjustment of correlated *internal* states" (consciousness) "to correlated external states." These internal states are, to phrase them generally, our feelings which, in the primitive life of child or savage, are wholly presentative and operate *directly*; concerned with the present, they demand and receive immediate gratification. As life, thus psychologically considered, develops it becomes complex, and this means that the present is postponed for the future. The presentative feeling is kept under by representative feeling. The inexorability of such development is at once apparent if we consider the difference between actions necessary to secure a million dollars and those necessary to secure a shilling. In the first case our activities demand an almost total subjection of immediate, presentative, feelings to remote and representative ones; in the second case, there is little or no postponement of desire.

Under evolution thus working, the remote, representative feelings acquire *authority*, that is to say, become *duties*, and the recognition of obligation is generated. If we inquire as to the origin of remorse we learn that it has a development corresponding to the growth of *penalties*. Had no penalties been experienced there would have been no remorse. These penalties, at their commencement, were of a decidedly physical kind, — such as fear of retaliation, of chief, of king; thence they passed to fear of public opinion, whether of family, tribe, or people; thence to fear of God, and lastly to fear arising from an intelligent recognition of the natural consequences of actions. This last is the fear belonging to a well-developed conscience, the fear of doing anything which, *in itself*, entails loss or pain. The typical man, acting in the light of an intelligent understanding of intrinsic



consequences, is happy, is without remorse, without conscience. He has freed himself from a sense of moral obligation by his morality, and he finds "that the sense of duty is transitory and diminishes as fast as moralization increases."

Evolution makes a definite and at the same time final presentation of ethics *sociologically* considered. Man is related to his fellows, and this relation becomes increasingly complex, that is, advanced, as the industrial state prevails over the militant. War hinders the adjustment of man to his fellows, and therefore keeps him, ethically speaking, on a lower plane. Peace furthers the morality of evolution as it furthers man's adjustment to his fellows extensively and intensively.

To use Mr. Spencer's words, morality becomes, in its last and highest expression, "The facilitation of life by exchange of services beyond agreement, the highest life being reached only when, besides helping to complete one another's lives by specified reciprocities of aid, men otherwise help to complete one another's lives."

Mr. Leslie Stephen has written a book entitled the "Science of Ethics," and he tells us that his purpose in so writing was to construct this science in harmony with the doctrine of evolution. I find Mr. Stephen's production a noteworthy example of how possible it is to write clearly and unintelligibly. This author's sentences, as sentences, are nowise obscure, but his discussion as a discussion seems obscure from beginning to end. There is, however, a general agreement that Mr. Stephen conceives right in terms of the welfare of the "*social tissue*." I quote an illustrative sentence respecting the virtue of *truth*: "Does the absoluteness of this rule" (the rule that demands truth-telling) "affect the doctrine that it expresses a condition of social welfare? Moralists agree approximately in the opinion that truthfulness is an essential condition of the welfare of society as known to us. This, according to me, is the *ultimate ground*, in a scientific sense at least, of its moral value."

The language here quoted seems explicitly to maintain that the standard of right and of wrong is the welfare of society. When we inquire as to the meaning of this term "welfare," it seems that the word should be interchangeable with "happiness"; yet Mr. Stephen assures us that such is not his use of the term. "Many things," he says, "might be duty and as such might advance the social welfare, which would not bring happiness."

"The welfare of the social tissue" is so general, so abstract, a

phrase, that we hesitate to accept it as the *sole* standard of human conduct. Society has no existence apart from individuals, and "welfare" can have no meaning except the getting on of these same individuals. It is most significant that Mr. Stephen, who finds his ultimate scientific ground for right in consequences, should confess himself unable to answer the question *why* the welfare of the social tissue ought to be regarded by individuals.

It is a fashion of recent writers on ethical questions to express the opinion that the utilitarianism of evolution is casting its old skin of hedonism and becoming a nobler affair. Mr. Darwin himself, it is said, does not make pleasure the standard of right — with him that standard is life. Mr. Stephen, as we have seen, finds the standard in "social welfare." If this be indeed a casting of the skin of hedonism, it is exchanging something definite for a pure abstraction, an outright nothing. The terms "life" "social welfare" require to have a fixed meaning by those who are to use them in determining the ethical import of conduct. The "life" of Mr. Darwin and the "social welfare" of Mr. Stephen can have only one of two interpretations. They must say to each individual, obey *your* conscience, that is, do the right as your *best judgment* points it out to you, and this regardless of consequences; or they must say to him, do those things which you believe have an intrinsic tendency to produce happiness for yourself and others. The former of these interpretations is intuitional morality, and the latter is hedonism.

Mr. Spencer seems, from the point of view of an evolutionist, entirely justified in saying that morality assumes life to be worth living; justified also in saying that it assumes the worth of living to be dependent on the excess of pleasure over pain in every average life.

I believe it is just to say that a science of ethics constructed in harmony with evolution must build on the hedonistic base, and I believe this equivalent to saying that ethics can be scientifically accounted for by evolution only after the distinction between right and wrong is obliterated. The ethics of evolution is an ethics with the moral factor omitted.

This seems a fitting place to call attention to the position of many recent writers on morals who, though rejecting the teaching of Mr. Spencer and Mr. Stephen, are yet persuaded that a science of ethics can be derived from a history of morals, and from that alone.

These authors lay *all* stress upon the historical method as

applied to our subject, and they seem convinced that this method will furnish us a defensible system of morality.

Their entire attitude is as that of a blind man who should essay to understand vision by a historical study of the use of the human eye. Without a test of the ethical a history of morals would be meaningless. To know that many of our most sacred moral virtues, chastity for example, had no place at all in the ethical consciousness of certain semi-civilized tribes would throw no light on the nature of moral obligation, its source, or its authority. This sole appeal to the historical method seems to forget that each individual presents himself to us in two distinct aspects, namely, the aspect of his actions, and the aspect of his character. The method forgets, also, that if we consider the outer side, the side of his actions, we may secure his natural history, may set out in orderly evolution the course of his conduct, and so secure a photograph of visible actions and of visible relations among these actions. Applying this to history at large we may discern the beginnings, the rudiments, of moral conduct; yet we do so only on the supposition that we know the differentia of conduct ethical, and can say that here is its earliest appearance. Starting with these rude moral actions, we may trace them from the savage to their most lofty expression in the typical civilization and the typical man of to-day. This tracing, however, is but the evolution of morality from *without*, a natural history of moralities; morality itself is not necessarily touched by such a presentation. Morality is in persons, not in actions. An act which, as a visible event taking place in time, we should be obliged to class as moral might, as the outcome of conscious self-determination, be immoral to the core. Ethics brings us to the inner aspect of the individual, and evolution applied here meets a problem not to be solved by mere historical treatment. Evolution is bound to give an account of the genesis of the moral consciousness in the individual man, and any reference to the outer course of his actions may leave the duty undischarged.

Having indicated briefly and, as I am aware, all too imperfectly, those definite reconstructions of ethics which evolution has thus far furnished, I would direct attention to a movement of quite another character, a movement whose bearing on ethics cannot long be concealed.

When speaking of conscience I used certain terms freely, — these were, "I," "mine," "you," "yours." Hitherto such words have been understood to stand for a most important fact — the

fact of personality. Since a strictly inductive treatment of ethics rules out metaphysics, we are obliged to inquire whether the term "person" has scientific standing, that is, whether it expresses a fact? In the words of James Ward, "person" means that "whenever we analyze our own consciousness or that of a snail, whenever we talk about ideas or emotions, there is always an individual mind or subject in question. We cannot talk of feelings, volitions, or knowledges; what we mean is that some individual man or horse feels, wills, and knows." Person "does not mean metaphysics, it involves no conception of mind-atoms or mind-stuff."

This teaching, which Mr. Ward justifies by many cogent considerations, is most important. There prevails among the scientists and affectation-skeptics a metaphysic-phobia nearly as over-mastering as the materialism-phobia among the conservatives. The term "person" is the red rag provoking all manner of fury. "I often lie here, Flaxman, wondering at the way in which men become the slaves of some metaphysical word, personality or intelligence or what not. Herbert Spencer is quite right. We no sooner attempt to define what we mean by a Personal God than we lose ourselves in labyrinths of language and logic. But why attempt it at all?" This paragraph, like the book from which it is quoted, is some considerable distance behind the advanced thought and method of our time. It has been discovered that we can use the term "person" as we use the term "iron," without the least attempt at definition, without the least particle of metaphysics. Not only so, it is quite apparent that we are unable to dispense with such words. "Person," "personality," are needed to express certain experienced and, at present, irresolvable distinctions, as gold, iron, aluminum, are used. No chemist attempts to define these terms; he means no more and no less by them than that they represent certain existences affecting us in uniform ways. Is it customary to charge the chemist with a belief in some occult quality such as "goldness," which gives to his specimen its character? Is the chemist a metaphysician because he asserts his belief in the existence of some sixty *distinct* elements? Because he divides his science into organic and inorganic, is he chargeable with some fusty metaphysical doctrine of a "*vital entity*?" Flaxman is asked, "Why attempt to define personality at all?" which question, by bad logic, is made equivalent to "Why use the term personality at all?" These questions are as distinct from one another as sounds are from silence. Fortunately

for human affairs, practical and theoretical, we are not compelled to define a piece of gold before using it or believing it. There are, of course, certain conclusions, reasoned conclusions, that grow out of a belief in gold; in like manner certain inferences follow from the belief in personality, inferences that can be drawn from nothing else. These conclusions, however, have no more to do with metaphysics than they have with the remotest star. If it be true that an *inductive* psychology involves a person, knowing, feeling, willing, and if we conclude therefrom that all states of consciousness, however complex, are manifestations of a person, that in personality we find the starting-point of all psychical life, are we delivering ourselves of metaphysics? Extend the question. If, because personal consciousness is our highest possession we refuse the term "God" to any mode of Being that is not Conscious Person, are we metaphysicians? Do we attempt to define God—to limit the Infinite? "I often lie here, Flaxman, wondering at the way in which men become the slaves of some metaphysical entity," iron, aluminum, bromine, "or what not. Herbert Spencer is quite right. We no sooner attempt to define what we mean by a "bromine substance, "than we lose ourselves in labyrinths of language and logic."

Here rather is the question. Does every human being present a form of existence such as cannot be otherwise spoken of than by the term "person"? If so, the ability to know the distinction between right and wrong may well be regarded as an *original mode of working* of this person. This, I say, may well be concluded, since the moral element has not, as yet, been successfully evolved, on other lines, by the labors of Mr. Darwin, Mr. Spencer, or Mr. Stephen.

In the question above submitted I have suggested the newer movement whose influence is, as I judge, to be decisive for a reconstruction of ethical doctrine. Those forms of human consciousness heretofore regarded as distinctive, such as personality, memory, volition, are examined with the keenest probing, and this examination is conducted on a strictly inductive line. Even as I write, an extensive volume has appeared aiming to show by facts that the generalizing power, up to this time judged so entirely man's own, is abundantly exhibited in the animal world. Pathology, with its abnormalities, such as personality overthrown, will weakened, reason distorted, is summoned to testify against all radical distinctions. The monographs of Ribot represent great industry directed to one end, namely, to show that personality is

nothing but the somatic unity and changing in all degrees as this physical unity changes. Facts will be heard and their bearing will be acknowledged. Hypnotism, but recently deemed worthy the attention of scientific men, has already a bibliography so extensive as to be startling in its significance, and, by its attested facts, is compelling a reconstruction of our conception of personality, together with our entire psychical doctrine.

As the conclusion of this paper, permit me to urge that those who concern themselves with questions of morals and religion should not reject the method of treatment demanded by physical science. Let not the statement be accepted that science is one thing, has one method, while philosophy is another thing and has another method.

This is the fashionable proclamation of many conservatives. Where science stops, they tell us, philosophy begins. Philosophy reads off the data of science in the light of its higher intuitions. Meanwhile, on all hands, the cry is sounded, "Give us grounds for belief," — such grounds, *in kind*, as the chemist gives his pupils, the historian his. We would have a reasoning similar in kind to that of the scientists, and would apply it to matters that much concern us, — to sin, suffering, death, immortality, God, Christ, Judgment.

I hail as the dawn, what so many regard as the night, this necessity now upon us of treating these subjects according to the requirements of sound inductive inference.

*W. R. Benedict.*

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

---

### THE POLARITY OF TRUTH.

THERE is a certain fascination for the human mind in the resemblances which can be traced between things material and things spiritual. Perhaps it is because human nature is the province where these two worlds lap on to each and lock into each other in close and vital conjunction. It may be simply the instinctive allegiance of humanity to its own constitution. Whatever the reason, the fact is sufficiently certified. Mankind in general has a native fondness for everything in the nature of parallel between the material and the spiritual. It is this fact which accounts for what Tennyson has called "Our matter-moulded forms of speech." In



this fact chiefly lurks the true poet's power to charm and to stir the world. This fact goes far to explain the success of teachers who are skillful in handling the parable and the allegory. The great Teacher of all, by speaking his gospel in parables, not only showed himself familiar with the world of nature; far more did He show his perfect familiarity with human nature. Westminster theology in its confessional forms seems certain, in this day, to be either revised or disused. But Westminster theology, wrought up into finest allegory by the master hand of John Bunyan, the Bedford brazier, how senseless for any one to think of revising. Not till the scores of languages into which it has been translated shall all be forgotten will "Pilgrim's Progress" go out of date. Butler's "Analogy" continued to be a power in the world of religious thought so long after its work of demolishing English deism was accomplished, not only from having truth for its cause, but as well from having analogy for its armor. Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" has made an impression in our time, far exceeding anything that it really contributes either to philosophy or theology, by reason of the original, the skillful, the engaging way in which it follows out certain novel and striking parallels between the material and the spiritual. The Bible itself vindicates its right to be called the revelation of God for all time, not only because what it reveals is the everlasting truth of God, but also because its methods of revelation comprise a very universe of symbolism. That there is exceeding danger in this way of handling spiritual truth will of course be admitted, for that admission is the best of testimony to the exceeding value of it. "The principles of nature and its laws are types and shadows of the Invisible," wrote Frederick Robertson. It is a single feature of the invisible, — the world of spiritual truth that we now make note of and attempt to study by the help of its shadow in the material world.

There is a certain phenomenon observable in the world of material substances and forces which has come to be known to science by the name of polarity. It is a phenomenon not easy to define in terms altogether clear, let alone any attempt to explain it. In the Dictionary it is put down as "That quality or condition of a body in virtue of which it exhibits opposite or contrasted properties or powers, in opposite or contrasted parts or directions." The late President Barnard describes it somewhat more technically, if not any more intelligibly, as "A physical character possessed in certain conditions by some bodies or their molecules, in virtue of



which they manifest in a determinate direction properties that are analogous, and at the same time contrasted on opposite sides."

The most familiar instance of polarity is no doubt in the common magnet, whose opposite ends are called its poles. While it is one piece of metal throughout, having the same substance, the same density, and so far as can be observed the same structure, the two ends of it show a singular unlikeness and opposition to each other. What one attracts the other repels. Each repels its like and attracts its unlike. The result of their unlikeness and opposition is that they reinforce instead of counteracting each other. And right here is the characteristic, the significant fact about this physical property called polarity. It is the existence in the same body of a distinct unlikeness, a certain contrariety to itself, which, however, does not interfere at all with its unity of substance, which augments rather than weakens its actual energy. And even in cases where there is no manifestation of active energy, the fact of polarity is still observable. It appears sometimes simply in an unlikeness of properties in the same substance under slightly different circumstances. "The most important examples of this," to quote President Barnard again, "are the polarity possessed under certain circumstances by the rays of light and heat." Polarity as a phenomenon of light has special pertinence to the present study, from the fact that light is the common, the well nigh universal symbol for truth. The Duke of Argyll, in his address upon "What is Truth," speaks of "That homology which all languages recognize between light and knowledge," and goes on to say, "It lies in the suggestion — which such correlated or adjusted physical and psychical facts must impress upon us — that just as we now know an eye to be an apparatus which enables us to appreciate the facts and phenomena of light, so our intellect as a whole is likewise an apparatus which enables us to apprehend those higher facts and relations between things and phenomena which constitute intellectual truth."

To discourse at all in detail upon the polarization of light would be almost as much aside from the present purpose, as it would be beyond the abilities of the writer. It is sufficient here to remark the fact, and leave the details of it to the painstaking men of science, who are competent to deal with them. The fact is this. When a ray of light passes through certain transparent substances at certain angles, it is found to have properties unlike what it had before. It is the same ray of light, yet it has come to be in certain respects unlike and opposite to itself. The same

phenomenon appears sometimes in reflected light, as a French scientist discovered, by observing an image of the sun mirrored in the windows of the Luxembourg palace. The light thus reflected had properties unlike what it had as it came directly from the sun. The same sunlight had a certain contrast and contrariety to itself. This is the phenomenon which has come to be known in physics as the polarity of light. It is a remarkable fact, considered in itself. No less is it a remarkable fact, when considered as type and shadow of a like phenomenon in the spiritual world.

Truth has its polarity, as well as light, the accepted symbol of truth. "All truth is one," we find it often convenient to affirm. And the affirmation is always entirely safe; as safe as to say that the sunlight is one; as safe as to say that the magnet is one piece of metal. Indeed, the unity of all truth is the prime axiom, — a kind of common denominator, to which all the axioms are reducible. But the very fact that we find it so often convenient, not to say necessary, to affirm the unity of all truth, what does it signify, but that truth has its polarity as well as its unity? Truth, while it is all one, has "that quality, in virtue of which it exhibits opposite or contrasted properties or powers, in opposite or contrasted parts or directions." Even within the same field, the truth often shows a remarkable unlikeness and opposition to itself; as the magnet repels at one end what it attracts at the other; as the sunlight, reflected from palace windows, did not behave like itself. And this is the case especially when truth passes through the medium of statement or is reflected in the mirror of thought. The direct sunlight is always unpolarized. Its polarity becomes observable, after it has come from crystal or mirror. In like manner the polarity of truth becomes observable, when it is subjected to the process of statement or reasoning. There are great truths which it is no more possible to reduce to a single statement, than it is possible to have a magnet with a single pole, or with its two poles identical. If anything like justice is to be done to such truths in the way of statement, the form of statement must be double. And the one statement will have in it a certain contrariety to the other. What is affirmed in the one appears to be denied in the other, as to the school-boy the minus sign at one pole of the magnet appears to negative the plus sign at the other pole. But as a matter of fact, the two statements do not contradict each other. So far from that, they supplement and reënforce each other. Neither statement holds so much of the truth as when it is held alongside the

other. Bend your magnet into a horseshoe, bringing its opposite poles alongside each other, and you bring to bear its full magnetic force. So truth in many cases is brought to bear in its full practical force, by taking advantage of its polarity, by holding it, and by stating it so as to bring its opposite poles alongside of each other.

There are instances enough to be cited of this phenomenon in the spiritual world so significantly symbolized by the physical fact of polarity. The few there is space for here may be confined to the single field of what is commonly known as revealed truth,—the truth which is more especially set forth and applied in the teaching of Scripture.

We meet at the outset with a remarkable instance of polarity in the great truth which is fundamental to all the teaching of Scripture, the being of God. God is revealed to us in Scripture, on the one hand by the attributes of infinity, on the other hand by the attributes of personality. Any statement made of this great truth of the divine existence must be really the two statements. And each will necessarily be in language that may easily be construed into denial of the other. If you lay down the single statement, "God is the Infinite, the Absolute," you take the risk of seeming to deny his personality. If your single proposition be "God is personal," you take the risk of seeming to deny his infinity. The attributes of personality carry with them a certain suggestion of limitation, which puts them in opposition to the attributes of infinity. How is one to get on with such truth? He has simply to recognize and accept it as a case of polarity. The two statements require to be affirmed side by side. Both are equally true; both are statements of the same truth. Neither of them is so much the truth as when it is held alongside the other.

It is another instance of the polarity of truth that we meet with when, under the full light of gospel revelation, the one living God is made known to us as having a certain threefold distinction within himself. How great the difficulty of stating the oneness of God so as to leave room for the gospel distinctions between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, will be readily recognized here. And quite as easily will be recognized the difficulty of putting the Trinitarian distinctions into a statement that will pass without being challenged as a denial of the unity of God. But the difficulty is no evidence that both statements cannot be true. It is the same kind of a difficulty that the physicist meets with, when he must attribute to the same magnet, or the same ray of light, certain

opposite properties. The best he can do is to mark the one pole of the magnet plus and the other minus, while he puts them alongside each other to secure the full energy of their magnetic force. It is like this with the unity of God in relation to the Trinitarian distinctions. They are the two poles of that great gospel truth by which men come to a knowledge of the only true God. Whatever contrariety of terms we may fall upon in our attempt to state them both, both require to be affirmed. Neither of them is so entirely true as when it is affirmed alongside of the other. Neither of them comes to full force in its bearing upon human life, except when it is held alongside of the other.

Close to this we come upon another instance of polarity in the field of Scripture truth. It is in what the gospel reveals as the truth with reference to the person of Christ. At the one pole are attributes of deity, at the other attributes of humanity. If you affirm the truth of either one, your language will of necessity be very similar to what it would be if you were denying the other. Your assertion of the true deity of Christ will be in terms easily convertible into contradiction of his humanity. Your assertion of the true humanity of Christ will be in terms easily convertible into contradiction of his divinity. In your formulas for the two you have to do much what the physicist does when he marks one pole of the magnet plus and the other minus, — put in a footnote that in this case plus and minus are both equally positive. The terms we are obliged to use in affirming both the true deity and the true humanity of Christ may carry in them by implication a certain mutual contradiction. But the things thus affirmed carry in them no contradiction. It is simply a case of the polarity of truth. Affirm both the true deity and the true humanity of Christ, and it is really a single truth you are affirming. Neither proposition is altogether true, except in its oneness with the other. Neither of the two is brought to bear in its full practical force, except as it be held side by side with the other.

Again we discover an instance of the polarity of truth, in the light which the Scriptural revelation throws upon the field of human nature. What is the truth about this human nature of ours? Is it truth to affirm the dignity of human nature; or is it truth to affirm the depravity of human nature? Attempt to affirm either, and you are liable to be understood as denying the other. Undertake to set forth in adequate terms the dignity of man as made in the image of God, and how easily you are betrayed into making a mere fancy picture, devoid of faithfulness to real life. Un-

dertake to do justice to the depravity of human nature, and you find yourself arraigned for doing injustice to its essential dignity. What does it mean? Simply that you are dealing with a matter, the truth of which has its polarity. The dignity of human nature is one pole of the truth with regard to it. The depravity of human nature is the same truth at its opposite pole. With all there is of contrast between them, there is no contradiction. Dignity and depravity are both alike the truth of human nature. Neither of them is so much the truth as when it is affirmed alongside the other. What testimony to this appears in the field of literature? A dramatist like Shakespeare, a novelist like Scott, makes good his claim to be called a master, because, as we say, he is so entirely true to human nature. Others, with much literary merit it may be, are not at all true to human nature. What makes the difference? Does it not consist largely in different ways of handling dignity and depravity as facts of human nature? The untrue writer works the dignity into one character and the depravity into another. The literary master puts both dignity and depravity into the same character, and so disposes them in their opposition to each other as to get for his resultant, on the one hand his hero, on the other hand his villain. This is one respect in which Shakespeare surpasses them all in holding the mirror up to human nature. And this is one thing that goes to make the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments the Bible of humanity. It is entirely true to human nature; true on the one hand to the dignity of it; true on the other hand to the depravity of it.

One further instance of the polarity of truth as observable in the teachings of Scripture will be enough to cite. It is the truth in the matter of divine grace as the great moral force in human life and character. If the Scriptures teach the truth at all, here is a chief truth of their teaching,—the presence and power of divine grace at work in the lives of men to effect their moral renovation. But this gospel truth that divine grace is the one efficient moral force for producing righteousness, goodness, worth, in human life, cannot be reduced to statement without making the form of statement double. If we say with Hamlet, "There is a divinity that shapes our ends," we have affirmed this truth as it is at one of its two poles. But if we stop with that it is not really the truth we have affirmed. To make the statement altogether true, we must affirm alongside of it the truth of what Cassius insists on when he says, "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in

our stars, but in ourselves." Human responsibility, the freedom of man's moral agency, is really the same truth with the moral efficiency of divine grace in human life. The two are not horns of a dilemma. They are poles of a magnet. With all the contrast and opposition that appear between them, they neither contradict nor counteract each other. Instead of that they verify and reinforce each other. Neither is so much the truth as when it is affirmed alongside the other. Both come to their full practical bearing when they are held side by side. It is in this way that they are brought to bear in the teaching of Scripture. The grace of God that bringeth salvation teaches us to deny ungodliness and to live godly.

So far, we have been simply taking observations of polarity as a fact in the world of spiritual truth. Beyond this are certain consequences and conclusions from the fact which also compel our notice. The fact of polarity, once brought to light, serves in its turn to bring some other things to light. There are several weighty matters pertaining to truth which are conditioned upon the fact of its polarity and largely determined by it.

There is first the matter of catholicity. The whole truth and nothing but the truth has come to be a kind of current formula with us. It is a most admirable formula, provided undue emphasis be not put on the second term of it. It is upon the first term that the emphasis really belongs. The whole truth first, then nothing but the truth. It is essential to catholicity that it be sufficiently inclusive in order that it may be properly exclusive. Our Lord in the parable declared it to be more for the advantage of his kingdom that some tares should grow among the wheat, than that any of the wheat should be rooted up. It is always more in the interest of truth that everything should be included in its realm which belongs there, than that everything should be kept out which does not belong there. A fraction of truth ceded to the kingdom of error will work more mischief than a fraction of error unwittingly annexed to the undivided empire of truth. The hardest factor to handle in solving the problem of catholicity is not the exclusion of everything which is not the truth, but the inclusion of everything which is part and parcel of the truth. The failures of men to attain to real catholicity have been the result far more of neglect to hold the whole truth than of neglect to hold nothing but the truth. A true catholicity is concerned first to affirm everything that requires to be affirmed. The truly catholic spirit is essentially an affirmative spirit. It is loyal to every province of truth, even when it may



have become dismembered, and for the time held in league with the kingdom of error. The truly catholic spirit is careful not to offset one pole of truth against the other. It makes sure not to mistake poles of truth for horns of a dilemma. What partisanship supposes to be two alternatives to be chosen between, catholicity sees to be two hemispheres to be held together.

This brings to hand a second matter which has light thrown upon it by the polarity of truth, — the matter of controversy. It is a thing there never has been any dearth of. The aggregate of it all makes a prodigious total. But if you subtract from that total everything in the nature of controversy that consists simply in pitting the two poles of a single truth against each other, the shrinkage would be something amazing. It is proverbial that controversy seldom terminates in the surrender of either antagonist to the other. Is it not because there is commonly some truth in what each holds as against the other? The truth which each partisan holds he values, not so much for its intrinsic worth, as for the service he thinks it will do him as a cudgel with which to lay out the other fellow. That is the very genius of controversy. It seizes upon one pole of a truth as if that were the whole of it, and thinks to fortify the citadel of truth by insisting on that to the exclusion of everything at all unlike or opposite to it. But all attempt to save the truth in that way is much the same as attempting to save one pole of a magnet by cutting it apart from the other pole. No sooner is the magnet cut in two than the pole to be dispensed with appears at the cut end of the other piece. Controversy, so far as it consists in affirming one pole of the truth to the denial or exclusion of the other, will always be a drawn battle. There will be heat to it, the fire will fly, — and in about the degree that the truth held by each antagonist is essential. Such has been the history of controversy. How many chapters of it would never have needed to be written, if only the polarity of truth had been recognized!

Another thing which the polarity of truth throws light upon is the matter of heresy. This is a delicate subject, it will be granted. It is a matter of which hardly any one is content to take any definition but his own. At least, every one wants the definition made so that he himself shall not be included under it. But after all there is a general principle in the matter. Dr. A. A. Hodge, in reference to a certain theological position, made a remark to this effect: it is orthodox in all that it affirms, and heterodox in all that it denies. Apart entirely from Dr. Hodge's application of it, that remark deserves to be perpetuated as a kind of general



equation for everything in the nature of heresy. It is not so much in what they affirm, it is chiefly in what they deny, that men fall into error. It is in negation that the essence of heresy lies. So long as you can hold a man to pure and positive affirmation as to his position, and not permit him to smuggle in any negative, masked under his terms, you are more than likely to find him asserting the truth. But the moment he begins his denials, the door is open for the introduction of error. It is by seizing upon a fraction of truth, and holding it in contradiction of some other fraction, that a man becomes heretical. When some province gets dismembered from the empire of truth, and is made the base for a campaign against the mother country, the result is a heresy. It is so that the great historic heresies had their origin. It is such they prove to be, when subjected to close scrutiny and final analysis. There is a kernel of truth at the bottom of the heap of chaff. There is Falstaff's halfpenny worth of bread to his intolerable deal of sack. Even the Roman heresy of the mediocrity of Mary has this truth in it, as Frederick Robertson points out, that the one divine Mediator includes in his sinless humanity a perfect womanhood, as well as a perfect manhood. And the fraction of truth in any heresy is almost sure to be the part of it that is really and positively affirmative. The error begins where the fraction of truth is turned into denial and contradiction of other things which are equally the truth. A prolific source of error lies in disregard of the polarity of truth.

A single other matter on which light is thrown by the polarity of truth will serve for a conclusion. It is the matter of using truth for the overthrow of error. It has come to be almost a proverb that the best way to dispose of error is to posit and publish the truth. As that maxim is commonly laid down and practiced, it means that error must be put down by affirming and emphasizing the truth of what error denies, if not by denying the truth of what error affirms. But the polarity of truth makes it clear that the maxim must mean more than that, if it is to be indeed a maxim, that is, the highest wisdom on the subject. Because truth has its polarity, to wage war upon error simply by affirming what error denies may be to stimulate and intensify it, as the negative pole of a magnet is intensified by increase of force at the other pole. To deny the truth of what is affirmed in support of error may be denying what is part and parcel of the truth itself. If error is to be vanquished, it is necessary, not only to assert and insist on the truth of what error denies, but equally to assert and insist on any fraction of the truth which error may

have seized upon as a basis for its denials. The faithful champion of truth will make sure that he is never betrayed into neglect or disloyalty toward any fraction of the truth even when error has usurped it. Rather will he outdo error itself in positing and publishing every such fraction of truth. He who would maintain the personalty of God against denials of it drawn from his infinity must be outdone by no one in ascribing to God every infinite attribute. He who would maintain the Trinitarian distinctions revealed in the gospel against denials of them based upon the unity of God must let no one outdo him in insisting that God is one. He who would maintain the true deity of Christ against denials of it based upon its humanity must be the most positive and emphatic in testifying of Christ that he is altogether human. He who would do justice to the depravity of human nature against denials of it based upon its dignity must be the very first to recognize and esteem the image of God in man. He who would vindicate for divine grace its sovereign moral efficiency in human life and character must yield to no one in the stress he puts upon human responsibility and the freedom of man. There is no defeat of error so effectual as to wrest from it any province of truth it may have usurped, and get that province annexed again to the empire of truth. The battle of truth against error always has about it certain features of a civil war. The cause of truth depends not only on saving those parts of it which are directly attacked, but also on saving those parts of it which are used as weapons against itself. The United States government waged war against the Southern Confederacy on the principle that those States of the South were a part of itself, not another government. The flag of the Union remained the same after secession as before. Not a stripe nor a star was subtracted from it. Amid the fire and smoke of every battle it floated, certifying that the cause it stood for was the cause of all the States, not simply of a part. So it must be with the banner of truth amid the battles that must be fought with error. The cause of truth includes every fraction and fragment that error may have succeeded for a little in detaching and appropriating to its support. The triumph of truth depends on saving and maintaining those parts of it which error perverts, as well as those parts of it which error assaults. The only real danger to the kingdom of truth is when it gets divided against itself. An important safeguard against such danger lies in giving regard and account to the polarity of truth.

*James F. Brodie.*

SALEM, MASS.

## SOCIALISM IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY.

SOCIAL problems are now everywhere discussed, and with a zeal and earnestness, combined with a seriousness of purpose, which proves that they are regarded as having an importance above almost any other problems which come before us. They are regarded not only with a speculative interest, which calls out the largest intellectual enthusiasm of the time, but the discussion has a practical purpose in view, and aims at the regeneration of society. Our generation feels that society can be improved, and that the means for its improvement are within our reach, and should be applied by us.

The interest and zeal which were once given to speculative questions in theology have been diverted to the problems of social organization and reform. In a measure this results because religion aims at a practical influence on the life which now is, and seeks to infuse into it the spirit of whatever practical considerations religion has to offer mankind. Such a prophet of social regeneration as Mr. Bellamy, in his "Looking Backward," appeals to very much the same considerations which have in all ages made the great religious reformers successful in dealing with the present hopes and desires of men.

The word socialism and that for which it stands are of very recent origin; they belong to the present generation. Recent as is the origin of socialism as a theory of society, it has come to have a most significant relation to social problems of every kind. This has been shown most emphatically in the great success of "Looking Backward," in the eagerness with which it is read and its theories accepted. What the author stumbled upon in the dark, according to his own statement, has been accepted with enthusiasm and unbounded confidence. It has already become a cult, a propagandi, and by some it has been accepted as a religion. It does not follow from this fact that the socialism of Mr. Bellamy is to take the place of every other form of political organization, only that the thoughts of men are turned to social reform and to the need of a new order of social organization. The dreams of men are now of this kind, their desires run this way, and their convictions of what ought to be make them wish for a better humanity, and a humanity which can be secured by some form of socialism.

It is characteristic of such prophets as Mr. Bellamy that they

ignore the past and the lessons of history; they think only of what is present, and of what ought to be. They see the evils which beset mankind, and they wish to get rid of those evils. They give little heed as to how the evils came into existence, or as to how society itself came to be what it is. This is something outside the trend of their thoughts, and something which they evidently think has no relation to the making of society better. To more studious minds, and to minds less given to dreaming, it is of great importance that mankind has had a history, and that order and law run through it from beginning to end. Society is not merely a play of individual forces or a shuttlecock of haphazard influences; but it is in a true sense an organism, every part of which has relation to every other part. The origin and growth of that organism can be explained by evolution, and by evolution alone. Society is not what it is as the result of chance, but as the result of all the past of mankind, and as the result of mighty forces of growth, order, law, and ideal aspiration, which have ever been at work in it.

The greatest of all influences which has ever worked in human society, to produce change and progress, has been the individual man. What could not have been brought about in any other way, has been accomplished by the individual force of such men as the Apostle Paul, Hildebrand, Dante, or Napoleon Bonaparte. Outside the influence of such individual and unique men, men whose coming cannot be anticipated or their influence explained on any other grounds than their own individuality, we have no methods of progress except such as may be defined by the student of the social organism. When we would get rid of what is evil in society the clearest and most direct way to do it is to work in harmony with the laws of social growth.

How has society come to be what it is? What are the laws of its growth? If we can discover by the study of the past how social changes have been brought about in other times and countries, we shall have a clearer conception of how we ought to proceed to secure a better social organization at the present time. History is always fruitful in suggestions concerning present problems; and the man who knows his history best is the man who has the clearest conception of what is the best solution of any urgent problem in the politics of to-day. The men among the founders of our Republic who had read history the most diligently were the men who did the most to shape its institutions, and to give them a character of fitness and stability.

It is now one of the most thoroughly established of historical conclusions, that society as we know it, that the State and all which belongs to it, including the Church and the School, began with the family. The family was the primary cell of the social organism; and through its differentiation, its expansion, every other form of social life has come into being. What existed before the family we cannot tell from history; but at the earliest period of our knowledge of mankind, from any kind of authentic record, the patriarchal family was the only form of social organization. Of this form of primitive life we do not know by the means of written records, or even from monuments, but from the evidence afforded by the study of words, and from the evidence of this primitive life imbedded in later institutions and forms of thought.

The history of the Aryan race has been traced back by scholars to a time when our forefathers lived in northern India, thousands of years ago. They describe for us the life of that far-off people, tell us how they lived, what they thought, and how they were organized socially. They tell us that these were an active people, restless with energy, and that some of them pushed away from the old home to settle in central and southern India; and traces of their life yet remain stamped upon the institutions and the religion of that country. Others of them migrated into Persia, and gave origin to the long record of empire and religion which that country affords. Other great migrations pushed farther west, wave on wave, founding countries, developing arts, literatures, and sciences, and laying the foundations of the greater part of the civilization and authentic history of the world. Out of these old Aryan migrations came the peoples of ancient Greece, Rome, and Germany, and of all the countries of Western Europe in modern times, which have sprung from them. Along this line of advancing life, from ancient India, through Persia, Greece, Rome, Germany, England, down to our own day and country, we can trace, step by step, the growth of the patriarchal family, into all the forms of social organization which these many thousands of years afford.

The Aryan people, when we first know of them and for a long time after, lived under a form of socialism, and knew no other kind of institutional life. How they came to outgrow this primitive socialism, because it was no longer fitted to their needs, because it was not expansive enough to permit of progress and the higher forms of civilization, is contained in one of the most

interesting of historic records; and none can have more of profit concerning the problems which are pressing upon us at this moment for solution.

The patriarchal family, as it is described by Sir Henry Maine, in his "Early History of Institutions," and in his "Village Communities in the East and West"; by Mr. William E. Hearn, in his "Aryan Household"; and by M. Fustel de Coulanges, in his "Ancient City," is very simple in character. The father retains his authority over his household so long as he lives, and over every child born into it. The family does not divide when the children come to maturity, but it holds together as one community, living in one common family, in one house or village, and having all things in common. When the sons of this family marry, the wives become integral parts of the family; into the family strangers are adopted by a solemn process, which makes them in the eyes of the family as if they had been born into it; and the children born of the members of the family have to be initiated by binding rites of a most sacred character. In this family there is no individual life apart from the community; no one can act for or by himself. The house, the cattle, the farm implements or the implements of the chase, and the land for tillage, pasturage, or for wood, belong to the family. In fact, here at the beginning of human society we find the most perfect form of socialism of which the world has known or of which it has dreamed.

It is just to call the patriarchal family a socialistic institution, because its members lived in one house or community, and because the possessions of the community belonged to it as a corporate body, and not to its individual members. The patriarchal family was much more than a family in the present sense of the word, for it included every human interest then known to men. The father of the family was its king and priest and judge; the heads of each branch of the united family formed a council for the management of its practical affairs, and the labors of the family, of every kind, were carried on by the united efforts of its members. On the hearth of the household a fire was ever kept burning, as a perpetual offering to its dead members, who were worshiped as the gods of the family. The uniting bond of this family life was religion, the sacredness of the family tie as watched over by the household spirits, and the worship offered around the common hearth to the family ancestors, and especially to its founder or first father. The oldest member of the family,



the living house-father, every day prayed to the household spirits and made offerings to them; and no act of the family life could take place without the sanction of its ancestral gods or guardian spirits. Birth, marriage, war, peace, the chase, tillage, death, were all under the oversight of the household spirits; and they gave authority and made sacred every deed of the community.

The primitive family was a corporate organization, held together by the most binding sanctions and obligations of religion, and by the closest ties of family interest and affection. The father had over the household the power of life and death; in his hands belonged all the other members of the family, and they could do nothing without his permission; and yet the house-father, who was at once the community chieftain and priest, could do nothing save through the corporate sanctions given him by the household of which he was the head. He did nothing as chief or as priest, acting simply as an individual; his every act in these official capacities had to be sanctioned by the corporate spirit of the community. When he spoke, it was the voice of the community which spoke through him; when he acted, it was the power of the community put in motion.

In this primitive family-community the land belonged to the household. It could not be alienated, it could not be sold, it could not be devised to another by will. Only at a much later period in social development was such a thing as a will known, for the individual had nothing which he could give to an individual descendant. Absolute as was in some respects the power of the father, he could not dispose in any way whatever of the land of the community. The land was a part of the life of the family, necessary to its perpetuity in the full sense, and every member of the family shared in it by absolute right. Most sacred did the primitive family hold its relations to its land and its other possessions, because the land held the family tomb, to it the most sacred of all spots on earth, for its life as a family, and its happiness hereafter, depended on the solemn continuance of the family connection with the house spirits. When the family tomb was alienated, the house spirits deserted the family, and without its gods of the hearth and the tomb the family was utterly bereft. The other property of the family also had its sacred relations to its life, because it helped to furnish the means by which the worship of the household spirits was preserved with sacred fidelity.

In the primitive family there was a most perfect community of interests. In the earliest time all the labors of the community



were shared in common. At a later time, when the community had grown larger, and there were separate households in a common village, there was a division of land and labors according to the needs of each household. The special feature of this life, from first to last, was its corporate and communal character, that it realized the dream of socialism to the fullest extent which was then possible.

In the course of time the patriarchal family became a clan, by the natural process of development. This came about in part by the natural growth of the family, in part by adoption, and because the size of the family became so great that expanded methods of government and tillage became necessary. When the family had become a clan, the tendency was for it to divide into separate families, each of which was a distinct family in itself, and yet subject to the clan regulations and community of interests. The clan or tribe was simply an expanded family, the family tie of blood and worship held its members together, and the same obligations of mutual helpfulness and responsibility continued between its members. A tribal hearth and common worship bound the families of the clan to each other; they worshiped the founder as a god, and his name became the name of the tribe. Mr. Hearn says that the kinsmen of the clan or tribe "bore a common name, and that name was a patronymic. They had a common worship of a common Eponym, they held their land in common, they had reciprocal rights of tutelage and of inheritance."

M. Coulanges has shown with wonderful clearness that the fundamental system of social and political life in ancient Greece and Rome was based on the family organization. The family grew until it became a gens, then the gens divided into many families. As the growth went on the gens, consisting of its many subordinate families, expanded into phratria or curia, and then it became a city, such as was Athens and Rome. Step by step, by natural laws of growth, the family developed into the state; but after it had become a city-state it still retained many of the characteristics of the primitive family organization. In Athens, the tie binding the members together, in the earliest times, was that of common worship, based on common descent from a powerful ancestor, the founder of the city. In the historic period of Athens and Rome the power of the family, so far as its own interests were concerned, was greater than that of the city, the family worship continued, the family community of interests re-

mained, the family laws of inheritance were as obligatory as ever, and the family managed everything connected with its own internal economy. Far down into the historic period of these cities, within the family the house-father was the ruler, and what the father did as the head of the household was not recognized by the city. Whatever crime a man might commit he could not be arrested in his own house, which was sacred from every form of intrusion. The primitive family life gave origin to the later legal saying, that every man's house is his castle.

A remarkable illustration of the fact that the ancient State was founded on the family is to be seen in the connection of the two among all the branches of the Aryan race, in the early historic period of Europe. In the Greek cities, and in Rome, the State did not consist of individuals, as it does with us; but the primary unit was the family. For the ancient State the members of the family had no existence; it did not know the wife or the sons or the slaves of the family. These were wholly under the rule of the house-father; and the State knew only the father into whose person, so far as it was concerned, was concentrated the being of every other member of the family. Thus it was that the patriarchal family continued to exist, and to have a powerful influence on the social and political life of men, long after the city and the state had come into existence.

The primitive simplicity of the family had departed before the historic period began, and with it went more or less of the socialism on which it was based. When the family grew into the clan, the heads of families became of a social rank higher than the other men, and thus an order of nobility was established. A greater or lesser number of men in every clan lost their rights of family relationship and inheritance, and thus a plebeian or lower class was formed. When clans became powerful they made war on other clans, and subjected the prisoners taken to the menial services of the farm and the house; and thus slavery was established. In these, and other ways, the perfect community of interests in the patriarchal family was lost; but still the family, to those who were members of it, was very powerful, and its rules were obligatory.

We cannot look anywhere into the early history of the Aryan races without coming upon evidences of the family life, and the powerful hold it had upon men under every form of their social existence. Its socialistic features were long retained, and account for many things in the early history of Greece, Rome, and the Teutonic races. Had it not been that the primitive family life

had made men familiar with the socialistic principle, it is not probable that the state would have undertaken many things which it actually accomplished in Greece. One of these was the provision of amusements for the citizens by the city, which was a characteristic feature of Athenian life. It was not the democratic nature of the Athenian government which led to this provision for public entertainments, and which caused them to play so large a part in the social, literary, and political life of the city; but the inherited socialistic tendency, which made the city the natural director of the industrial and social interests of the people.

In Rome it was the same tendency which caused the city to provide for the physical wants of its citizens out of the public treasury. As Athens provided the theatre on the socialistic principle, so Rome gave its citizens free corn, free baths, and the sports of the amphitheatre. Whatever the reasons given by the Roman rulers for these socialistic methods of political administration, the fundamental motive for them was the inherited principle of communal life. That principle may have been modified or forgotten, but its influence was powerfully effective, because there were behind it the sanctions of a long past.

When a crime was committed among the early Teutonic races the socialistic idea went to the extent of making the tribe responsible for it, both in its corporate capacity, and in the person of every one of its members, in case the crime was against a member of another tribe. It was the duty of the tribe to which the injured person belonged to avenge his hurt, and this was regarded as a sacred and most solemn responsibility, from which no one could shrink. The tribe felt that it had been insulted and injured in the person of its member; and it was the honor of the community which was revenged, far more than the injury to a single individual. In war and in peace, in the chase and in the labors of tillage, the members of the tribe were bound together by the closest ties of fellowship and community of interests. The members of the tribe regarded themselves as descendants from a common ancestor, and, with few exceptions, they were such; and the community feeling among them was of a most sacred and binding character.

It appears to be the most natural thing in the world that social organization and political life should have begun in the family; but it is curious to note how persistently the family idea held its own, and controlled the forms of political organization. The socialism of the primitive family has held its own more persistently

than almost any other form of institutional life; and we may find traces of it even to our own day, if we look closely for them. This was partly because it was so admirably fitted to the primitive needs of men, and partly because it became through inherited drill, as it were, a part of man's social being.

According to the ethnologists, it took man a long time to recognize and to appreciate monogamic marriage, without which the patriarchal family could have had no existence. Even the primitive family life implied a long process of drill in habits of order, obedience, and respect for institutional life. Nothing was more difficult for the primitive man to acquire than an orderly life, based on persistent habits, that were conducive to the good of the family. Custom in the primitive family had all the force of law, and it was the only law under which the community lived. We are not to think, however, that custom was then any such haphazard thing as it is now, for it ruled the life of the primitive man to the minutest details of his daily existence, and with reference to every phase of his individual and social being.

The patriarchal family was a despotism of the most pitiless kind. It was necessary that it should be so, in order that it might hold its members to their obligations; and it became so through its socialistic character. The place and the duties of every member of the family were determined by birth, and the law which ruled the individual life was determined by status. According to Bagehot, in his "Physics and Politics," early law rested on status, social position, the fixed place of birth in the social order. Every act in life was settled by usage and custom, or by habit in its social sense. A man's gens or phratry determined for him his habit of mind and his thoughts. It also fixed for him every act of his life, from the cradle to the grave; it began its influence over him before he was born, and it did not cease to deal with him even after he was dead. This was an inevitable result of the socialistic character of the early family and tribe, that individual action was unknown, that toleration was an impossibility, and that liberty did not exist even in the dreams of men.

The primitive family was at last destroyed, and the social and political structure which had been built upon it. In order that society might exist, the patriarchal family was necessary; but there came a time when it was a hindrance, and not a help. It could accomplish what the primitive man needed, what the tribal and the barbarous man needed; but it could not accomplish the

work of the civilized man. The very drill which men had received in fitting them for family life, the drill in habit and custom, became a hindrance when they had advanced far enough to take up in earnest the work of civilization. Nearly every conflict in the history of Athens, Sparta, and Rome, of an internal nature, at least, was due to the conservative character of the inherited family life, and the stubborn persistence of its customs. The conflict in Sparta with the Helots, in Athens with the slaves, and in Rome with the clients and plebeians, was a result of the old family life. In each of those cities only those who had kept untainted the family and tribal inheritance were given citizenship; but outside the small and exclusive class of citizens, who still retained the old sacred ties and comradeship, there grew up a large class who had no privileges directly uniting them to the tribes or to the city. When these outside classes became strong enough they arose in rebellion, and were either mercilessly suppressed or else admitted to citizenship, artificial tribes being created for their reception.

The clan spirit, based on the inherited family idea, was so powerful in Greece that a true state was never formed among the Hellenes. The farthest they could get towards it was the city, which was a combination of tribes, and in which the tribal customs were dominant. For a little time the cities came together to fight the Persians; but they could not, from the persistence of the clan feeling, be brought to unite under one permanent form of government. To this was due, much more than to anything else, the rapid decay of Greek political influence. In Macedonia the tribal influence was broken up under the personal sway of Philip; and had Alexander the Great lived he might have built up a powerful Greek empire. As it was, he carried Greek culture into the life of the world, and helped thereby to make it one of the most fruitful of spiritual influences in the history of mankind.

It was due to Rome that the power of the old family life was broken. With remarkable ingenuity and breadth of historic insight M. Coulanges and Mr. Hearn have traced out the causes by which this result was brought about, and the control of the State established in place of that of the family and the tribe. One of these causes was the extension of the Roman power by conquest, and the adoption of conquered peoples into the rights of citizenship. Another was that, through various influences, land came under the dominion of the state, and ceased to be under that of the family. Conquest, migration, commerce, intellectual inquiry by the means of travel and the diffusion of Greek literature

and philosophy, helped to break down the old social exclusiveness, and to prepare the Roman people for world conquest and rule.

The greatest effect wrought by the power of Rome was the emancipation of man from the dominion of the patriarchal family. Rome learned the worth of the individual man, and took from him the chains which the clan had bound upon him, and had kept there for ages. In other words, Rome destroyed socialism as a universal form of social organization. In the development of humanity the time had come for individual initiative, and for liberty to the individual man. Rome broke down the old customs that had controlled men for so long, she gave to men the right of individual ownership and control of land, and for the first time in the history of the Aryan race she made the individual the basis of her rule. It took a long time to bring about these results, and Rome accomplished them only in part; but Rome laid the foundations for all modern progress, and for all civilization, in emancipating the individual from the thralldoms of the past.

In one of his later chapters Mr. Hearn makes this significant statement, a statement borne out by all history: "The history of individual property and the history of personal liberty coincide. Both of them resulted from the disintegration of the Household." This simply means, that socialism had been tried on the most extensive scale, as a universal form of social organization, and for a very long period, and had been found wanting. The primitive socialism was dull, wanting in initiative, and incapable of giving men social progress in the higher sense. The private ownership of land began in Rome for the first time on a scale large enough, and under such conditions, as to influence social and political growth. It was a condition necessary to civilization in any extended sense; and when established in Rome it gave to that country a new life and energy.

Other forces were also at work to give recognition to the individual man. Among these were Greek culture and the Jewish religion, as they began to diffuse themselves among all the countries about the Mediterranean, in the second century before the Christian era. Their influence was extended and elevated by Christianity itself, which was one of the most individualistic of all social forces, in its recognition of personal responsibility to God. The destruction of the patriarchal family, begun by Rome, was completed by Christianity. The Christian teachers found in the old family worship their hardest enemy to conquer; but at last they overcame it. It was the teaching of the Apostle Paul, es-



pecially, which broke down the tribal spirit, both among Jews and Gentiles, and which gave worth and dignity to the individual believer, in his doctrine of salvation by faith. The idea of corporate salvation, of salvation by virtue of connection with the Church, lingered for ages yet to come; but both Jesus and Paul taught that the individual soul may be at peace with God through personal faith, without regard to nationality, sex, social condition, or religious rites. Christianity struck a deadly blow at the old socialism, in its conception of individual responsibility, and in its doctrine of personal salvation.

The work which was begun by Roman law and Christian Gospel was continued by many other influences, for the tendency was towards more of personal liberty and individual freedom. One most powerful influence came with the conquest of Rome by the Teutonic nations, their incorporation into the empire, and their infusion of new life into it. The breaking up of the old Roman world, and the long period of chaos which followed, helped to bring the old institutions to an end, and to prepare for the modern world. New beginnings were made, new nationalities appeared, a fresh social order came into being, and out of the ruins of the old world the new appeared. There was no break, however, for the slow processes of growth were at work through all these centuries, that there might finally come into existence a general social order based on the recognition of the individual as the foundation of the State.

Mediæval Christianity wrought powerfully in creating a spiritual bond uniting men to each other on a basis higher and nobler than that of the family or the tribe or even than that of nationality. It gave men a fellowship larger than that created by provincial prejudices and national exclusiveness, for it made men feel that they belonged to one common household of faith. Feudalism also widened the life of men, by making the tie uniting them to each other that of vicinity or territorial sovereignty rather than that of blood. This was one of the steps on the way from the old family life to the democratic government of the present day; and its value was that it made those who lived near each other feel a relationship of obligation and humanity, which had not before existed. In the same direction chivalry was effective, for it united in one many previous influences, and made the knights the champions of the oppressed, and of all those whose individual weakness was such as to make them powerless against the strong and the mighty.

The tendencies of modern life and thought have been towards the emancipation of the individual man, the making him the basis of all institutional life, and the giving him the right to act and to think for himself. The Renaissance was emphatically of this character, liberating men from the intellectual bondage of the Church, and giving to the individual thinker the courage of his own convictions. It tended to break down the claims of intellectual authority, as represented by Aristotle and the Scholastic philosophers; and it raised up such men as Bacon, Galileo, and Bruno, to fight the battles of liberty of thought. By them modern science was created, and modern philosophy came into being through their influence.

Not less important, in the same direction, was the work done by the Reformation, which based itself on the individualism in the teachings of Jesus and Paul, and their doctrine of personal salvation, rejecting the corporate salvation taught by the Catholic Church. The struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism, in the sixteenth century, was not merely a quarrel about doctrines, but it was even more a contention between the ancient and the modern idea of social organization or the socialistic and the individualistic conception of man's relations to God. Is man saved by virtue of his connection with the corporate life of the Church, or is he saved by virtue of his own personal relations to Christ? That was the real contention which divided the Church; and because of it there can be no doubt as to the true historic significance of Protestantism. It applied the modern spirit to religion; in its doctrines and in its methods it was individualistic.

The appearance of free cities at the end of the Middle Ages; the growth of commercial enterprise, following the invention of the mariner's compass; the discovery of America, and the spirit of adventure which followed; the astronomic discoveries of the early modern period, and the new conceptions of the universe they produced; the invention of printing, and the marvelous increase of books which resulted; the growth of industrial life during the eighteenth century; the revolutionary tendencies which displayed themselves so frequently from 1775 to 1850; the establishment of constitutional governments during the same period, as a result of the revolutions; the growth of the democratic spirit during the last hundred years in all civilized countries; the awakening of working men to claim for themselves a larger recognition in the social order and in the State, are but parts of the growing spirit of individualism, which has made, and is continuing to make, the true progress of the modern world.

The growth of the spirit of toleration during the last two hundred years is in itself proof that individualism is coming everywhere to be accepted as a great need of mankind, and as a primary element in every kind of social organization. Under the rule of primitive socialism the opinion of the individual was of no importance whatever, and it was suppressed with the most vigorous hand. It has taken men many ages to learn the worth of individual thought, and to learn that social organization can be made effective and strong on the basis of a full expression of individual opinion. For ages the Church suppressed every individual opinion, for ages the State allowed the people no voice in the government. To-day we find that democracy is the form of government which the people everywhere desire, and toleration has become universal in matters of religion.

In so far as the modern world is superior to the ancient world, the superiority is due to the growth of individualism. At the present time the great need of the world is for a farther extension of the individual spirit, and for the more complete establishment of the democratic idea. Even yet the worth of the individual man has been recognized only in an imperfect sense, and the rights of the individual are too often ignored. We can have a true social order only when every individual in the community has been given a voice in its affairs, and only when the worth of the individual soul is recognized as of greater value than money, social position, inherited titles, or landed estates, however great or however long continued in one family.

Socialism is simply a "survival in culture." It is an attempt to realize at the present day what the whole of modern history has condemned. All the progress which the world has made during the last two thousand years has been the result of growth away from the methods and the principles of socialism. When men find themselves incapable of dealing with the large problems of modern life, when they lose faith in humanity, when they fail to have the gift of historic insight, they turn to socialism as affording a short and easy remedy for the social ills which our complicated modern life has produced.

What socialism is in its practical workings the history of mankind affords abundant examples. In the present, as in the past, the life it produces is narrow, dull, and unfruitful. It satisfies the physical needs of men, but it does not minister to their intellectual or their spiritual education. For the sake of feeding the weak as well as the strong, it levels the wise to the same narrow

round of life and thought as the ignorant. It is a procrustean bed, which stretches out the short, and which lops off the long, until all are of the same length. It destroys genius, makes the poet and the philosopher impossible, and turns the new Hampden into a village cowherd.

It has been shown by M. Emile de Laveleye, in his book on "Primitive Property," that the old family community has continued down to our own day in many parts of Europe. He finds abundant traces of it in Russia, Switzerland, Germany, and Holland. In most other countries, even in England not long ago, and in the American colonies of the seventeenth century, it had its existence, and has left its indications even to the present time. In Switzerland, many of the characteristics of the primitive life are yet to be found in the socialistic nature of the village organization. Especially in Russia does the old clan life continue a powerful factor, for over vast regions of country the village community is to-day very much the same that it was among the early Aryans. The Russian Mir is based on community of land, and a common village life. The land is owned by the community or held in common from some noble; and it is periodically partitioned out to the families of the community. The Mir differs from the ancient family or clan in the fact that its uniting bond is common possession of land, and not blood relationship or community of ancestral worship.

Wherever the village socialism yet remains, as an inheritance from the far-off past, its characteristics are much the same. In Russia or India, Switzerland or Holland, the results it produces are of the old kind. M. Laveleye believes in socialism, and he has written his interesting book on "Primitive Property" as an argument in its favor; but when he describes the Russian Mir he indicates what are the results which it produces. He says that the American is "eager for change and action, always in search of novelty, freed from parental authority in his earliest years, accustomed to count on no one but himself and to obey nothing but the law, which he has himself helped to make," and that he is a finished type of individualism. On the other hand, "the Russian is resigned to his lot, attached to ancient tradition, always ready to obey the orders of his superiors, full of veneration for his priest, and his emperor, and content with an existence which he never seeks to improve." There is no pauperism in the Mir, it is true, but there is no progress in it, no advancement in education, no enlargement of the individual life. M. Laveleye admits

that the agriculture is of the old kind ; no extended improvements are made, even where they would pay large returns ; and agricultural machinery is never introduced.

It is very certain that a life such as this would never, in even the least degree, advance the world into a higher civilization. The same may be said of socialism as it has appeared in England and America, as the result of dissatisfaction with the present industrial and political order. From 1830 to 1845 socialism was preached with a zeal unknown even at the present time, and something like a hundred communities were started. Most of them did not last long enough to give any hint of the kind of life they would produce ; but those which passed the initial stages of organization showed the same results with the Russian Mir. Nearly every one of the communities then formed, which is now in existence, had a religious basis ; and all of them have produced a dull and monotonous life. The members of the existing communities live without fear of want, but there is an entire lack of energy, of originality, and of fresh, strong life. For the sake of bodily comforts to all alike, these socialistic communities sap the higher life from their members, and sink them to the dead level of a common uniformity.

No socialistic community has long held together which did not lower the level of intellectual and spiritual life in its members. If its constituent elements are of so superior a kind as to successfully resist this degradation of the individual, the community invariably comes to an end in a short time. Pythagoras drew about him a community of superior people, attracted to him by his genius, and held together by his fruitful intellectual life ; but his community came to an end as soon as it was brought into sharp contact with the outside world. Brook Farm included many intelligent and superior people, and it lived as long as it did because of their sacrifices and enthusiasms ; but from the moment of its organization it contained the elements of its own destruction. These were in some degree held in check by the pluck and persistence of Mr. Ripley ; but no effort of his could prevent the final doom. Socialism is contrary to human nature, and to all that is best in it. Blind obedience does not develop the true man, but the man stunted and perverted, the man crippled in his best instincts and capacities.

The new socialism, the socialism of theory, demands that the State shall have the control and ownership of all the natural means of production, and of all the invented implements of indus-

try. It also demands, in the name of justice, that labor shall be regarded as the only productive agent, that the results of labor shall be justly shared by all who produce them, and that competition shall cease as a social influence. This theory, in many of its features, is opposed to the great lessons of the past, which prove that competition, in its form of individual initiative and enterprise, has been one of the largest and most effective agents in the advancement of humanity.

It is also opposed to the fact, that just in so far as individualism has been manifested in industrial and political life has there come about an effective recognition of the true social ties which bind men to each other, and which create the brotherhood of man as a practical force in society. The recognition of the *solidarité* of the race has been the result of the recognition of the personality of man. The ties which unite men to each other should be from within, and not from without; the result of motives of justice and love, and not the compulsory obligations of governments. We are to seek the kingdom of heaven, and its righteousness, before these other things can be added to us; and the kingdom of heaven comes not with observation, for it is ever within us.

If the form of socialism suggested by Mr. Bellamy, under the name of "Nationalism," could be put into practice under the most favorable conditions, it would probably repeat the history of the past. If it succeeded it would lead to a despotism as inflexible as that of the primitive family; and it would lead to a stupidity as persistent as that of the Russian Mir. While it might bring to an end the social inequalities of the present, it would also destroy the social progress we are now making. The history of mankind abundantly condemns such a scheme, and does not fail to tell us of the stagnant and unfruitful life it would produce.

The believer in individualism is not forgetful of the hard lot of many, brought about by the present form of social organization; but he thinks there is no evidence whatever that socialism will prove an effective remedy. He reads history to the effect that social fellowship has grown with the growth of individualism, and that it is the democratic spirit which has led to the doctrine of the brotherhood of man. It is because the slavery which the old socialism produced has been destroyed by the individualistic spirit, that the working men have been so far elevated socially as to realize their own position, and to ask for greater opportunities than they now possess. The progress which has come with mod-



ern industrialism has created the social problem of the present day. All that can be said against it is that the competition it produces does not give a sufficient opportunity to the weak. It can be said in its favor, however, that it has elevated the working class, and that it has given them opportunities which they have never possessed at any time in the past.

The social problems which now cause so much agitation are, in the light of history, of a temporary character. They have grown up within a century, as the result of the marvelous development in inventive skill; and there has not yet been sufficient time to adjust our social life to the new conditions. That such adjustment will come about every wise student of history must believe; and it will probably come in no small measure through the very conditions which industrialism has itself produced. In no small degree, the commercial spirit of our century is teaching us the practical worth of the brotherhood of man, that no one country can live to itself alone, that the interests of all countries are identical, and that unrestricted reciprocity is demanded in the interests of trade itself.

The remedy for the social ills of our day is to be found in an increase of individualism, and not in the fictitious method of socialism. We need to carry still farther those methods which have produced the better social and political life we now enjoy. We can never do away with the stimulus of individual motive or the energizing power of personal necessity. Brook Farm was crippled by those who sought it out as a refuge from the responsibility of personal exertion. Every other socialistic community has had to contend with the same difficult problem, that only those who lack in moral and intellectual stamina desire the easy life which it affords.

The real problem, then, is of another kind than that which socialism presents. The real question is, How can those who are weak be taught to become self-dependent? A hint towards a true answer to this question has been suggested by the methods adopted by the Associated Charities, when they insist that only those who try to help themselves can be assisted, and that true charity consists in helping people to help themselves. It is not the pauperized man of socialism which the working men of this country have as an ideal, but the man who makes his own way in the world, assisted by the kindly help of his fellows among the rich and the poor.

In the past, society has been improved by the improvement of

the individual. That is the lesson of history, written in letters of light for those who care to read. When we would elevate the community it can be done effectively by elevating the individual; and when we would secure the interests of the individual it can be done by securing the interests of all other individuals. The democratic spirit yet remains the most vital power at work for social improvement.

*George Willis Cooke.*

DEDHAM, MASS.

---

### THE NEW BASIS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

It is not a public calamity that the national education bills have been, are now, and are likely yet to be the political foot-balls of the national Congress. The numerous debates, arguments, speeches, editorials, and social discussions which are rife in town and country have had, and are having, an excellent educating effect, and our legislators and the people are more accurately informed as to the social status, the natural endowments, the mental, ethical, and religious character and acquirements of the race, which, to a greater degree than any other, it is proposed to make the fortunate or unfortunate beneficiary of the national and State charity. These discussions have also enlightened us as to the by no means enviable position of the Southern white communities which are held unreasonably responsible by our Northern enthusiasts upon the subject of negro education, not only for the negro's civil rights, but for his intellectual, moral, religious, economic, and social progress and development, as if the negro was still in bondage and bodily subjection, entirely obedient to the government and behests of his master, and possessed of no social rights, duties, obligations, or personal independence.

Standing apart, above party and sectional strife and influence, in an independent position, and looking carefully over the field, we can see coming into view upon the horizon a middle ground, which is soon to be happily occupied by those whose views are now so divergent upon the subject of negro education: these on one side, who demand for him immediate recognition as the intellectual, ethical, religious, and social equal of the Anglo-American, and those on the other, who declare him to be anatomically, physiologically, and in every other respect the inferior, and

doomed by nature forever to be a "hewer of wood and drawer of water" for the superior race. The creed of the occupants of the middle ground regarding the negro is, that at the present moment, he is inferior intellectually, ethically, and industrially to the Western Aryan, and that a system of education to be of service to him must honestly, philosophically, and practically recognize the difference in the present actual development of the two races. They do not deny, and have no desire to deny, to the negro whatever his natural faculties, development, and progress have given him up to the present time, or in the least degree to impeach, or prejudice, or qualify the possibilities which the future may have in store for him under favorable conditions for his development. They insist, however, and will persist in the opinion, that, disguise it as we may, the two races now occupy, and in obedience to the decree of a ruling Providence must follow, two distinct planes of development, a higher and a lower plane, and that, as an obvious corollary, the negro, to derive the greatest practical benefit from his enforced tutelage, must not suddenly be thrust into the higher plane, but be instructed within the confines of his own powers, mental, ethical, and industrial, and upon the line of his own development, or, in simpler phrase, that the educating means must be adapted to his racial condition and character, and to the end to be attained. Furthermore, they declare that the negro cannot be absorbed or assimilated racially, or socially, and that any attempt at such absorption must be at the expense of the degradation of the more highly developed race.

This creed of the middle ground is not the fine-spun product of a theoretical study of the subject, but the result of practical observation and practical experience in teaching and dealing with the race, and its advocates have abundant evidence to support every position taken. It is a singular fact that no educational bill yet presented to Congress has recognized this difference in racial needs and development which the creed of the middle ground declares is absolutely essential in any philosophical and practical educational scheme, and without which recognition they do not hesitate to predict the ultimate and practical failure of any bill to accomplish the result desired; namely, the religious, moral, and industrial elevation of the negro. The bills before Congress which have attracted the attention of the public have been drawn in the North, and generally by those who have had little or no experience in teaching or in observation of the Southern type of

negro, and little acquaintance with his peculiar needs and necessities. The demand for this legislation has also come from that section which suffers the least from illiteracy, from crass ignorance, and inferior racial development, a curious circumstance which may be accounted for by the perfect concept of the negro, general in the South, and the consequent utter hopelessness which has there prevailed of obtaining rational legislation by Congress for the promotion of his literacy, and his moral and industrial development.

This domination of the North in educational matters is not confined to the initiative in remedial legislation; insensibly, perhaps, but none the less effectively and completely, Northern educational ideas have dominated Southern methods, to the exclusion of systems which the South knows, and which many of us now know, to be more rational, philosophical, and effective. This deference to Northern educational opinion into which the South has drifted since the emancipation of the negro is certainly remarkable, and can be accounted for only by the existence of the conviction that an attempt to maintain a system of education for the negro in any respect differing from that maintained for the whites, however well founded and justified by common sense and common experience, would have the appearance of race discrimination, and have produced such a howl of disapprobation and discontent at the North as to be exceedingly uncomfortable and embarrassing. This hypercritical and hypersensitive state of the Northern mind since the days of reconstruction has already worked great political, social, and industrial injury to the negro and to the Southern States. It has deprived the former of that technical, industrial, and moral training of which he is sorely in need, and has deprived the latter not only of a much larger body of intelligent farmers, mechanics, and industrious citizens than their present educational system can furnish, but of enormous sums of money uselessly and aimlessly spent in secondary and superior education, in support of their position.

The occupants of the middle ground maintain that the superior memory and remarkable imitative faculty of the negro are unfortunately coupled with weak assimilative and imperfectly developed mental powers, and that the advantage he possesses in memory and observation is weakened by his deficiency in the logical faculty. They stand opposed to secondary and superior education for the negro at the expense of the national or State governments, for the reason that the negro, in his present status,

lacks a high power of continuous logical thought, of sound reasoning, and of persistent, careful application in mental or physical labor, and maintain that such instruction is, for the present, at least, misapplied. They believe that the colored product of the union of the two races, the mulatto — in whatever proportion his blood may be mixed, griffe, quarteron, or quinteron, — has a mental development superior to that of the negro, in direct ratio with the quantity of Aryan blood in his veins; while the peculiar disease-resisting power of the negro is in inverse ratio impaired by the higher organization thus acquired. They maintain that the religion of the negro is largely emotional, sensual, and superstitious, conveying little if any sense of moral responsibility, having little relation to personal life and conduct, and scarcely a trace of inward spirituality founded upon real religious sentiment. They declare that the character of the religion and the mythology of the Southern negro unquestionably fixes and determines his racial status; he is not a moral idiot, but his moral stature is limited, hampered, and retarded by his heredity, from which he cannot at once escape, and from which he requires to be led out. They maintain that his want of skill, of dexterity, of hand training, his restlessness under confinement and restraint, his weak understanding and consequent difficulty in comprehending mechanical operations and machinery, effectually exclude him in his present status from all employments requiring close attention and application, quick intelligence, good judgment, and carefulness, and that in the great demand for skilled labor in the South consequent upon the great industrial movement there, the negro is reluctantly left behind.

Holding these views of the present status of the negro race, the occupants of the middle ground insist that any system of education designed for its improvement must practically recognize it. They do not deny that the negro race has produced some exceptionally brilliant men; on the contrary, they welcome the fact as evidence of what the race can accomplish under a rational treatment, and they are still further encouraged by the fact that among these men, conspicuous by their unusual ability and accomplishments, a majority will be found in accord with their own views of the present necessities and requirements of the negro race in America. Conspicuous among these men is Dr. Blyden, — a pure negro, — thirty years resident among the Americo-Africans of Liberia, an author well known here and in England. In a discourse upon the negro's mental powers, delivered at Monrovia,

Liberia, before Americo-Liberians, he declared it to be necessary "to develop in the negro the thinking faculty — to strengthen his brain — to develop and strengthen his reason, and at the same time to govern his imaginative faculty by common sense."

Thomas Fortune, the colored author of a remarkable social study, and editor of the New York "Globe," declares that "they [the negroes] should be instructed for the work to be done." "Many a farmer boy or mechanic has been spoiled to make a foppish grumbler or loafer, a swaggering pedagogue, or a cranky homiletician. Men may be spoiled by education, even as they are spoiled by illiteracy. Education is preparation for future work, hence men should be educated with special reference to that work."

Dr. Brummell, a negro clergyman of Washington, D. C., and one of the ablest and clearest thinkers of his people, is equally positive and emphatic upon these points. In a sermon upon "Common Sense in Common Schooling," he says: "I maintain that parents should exercise discrimination in this matter. They have no right to raise up a whole regiment of pretentious and lazy fools to plague society and to ruin themselves. They have no right to send out into the world a lot of young men and women with heads crammed with Latin, Greek, and literature; with no heart to labor; with hands of baby softness, interested only in idleness, and given to profligacy and ruinous pleasure. And just this, in numerous cases, is the result of the ambitious system of education in this land."

The doctrinaires who insist upon this largely intellectual training for the negro do so upon the false assumption that mere intelligence unguided and uncontrolled, will make a good citizen. Intelligence is power, but like the great natural forces, if uncontrolled, is a power for evil, as well as for good.

The occupants of the middle ground, recognizing these deficiencies of our educational systems North and South, as regards the negro, declare that to raise him to a higher plane —

(a) A desire for a higher religion must be implanted and nourished.

(b) That his head and his hands must be educated together.

(c) That in place of Latin and Greek, the *Georgics* of Virgil, and the poems of Homer, he must be trained industrially and technically.

(d) That he must be taught that imitation is not the *end*, but the *means* of development.



- (e) That dependency is not manliness ; and
- (f) That social rights and fortunes are not acquired by legislation, but by patient industry, frugality, and economy.

In accomplishing this result they believe secondary and superior schools to be unnecessary, and that primary education (reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and civics), strongly based upon religious and moral instruction, and reënforced by industrial and technical training, will be much more effective. They further believe that such a system of public education would be useful to both races wherever it is practicable to establish it. With the negro it is practicable in every Southern State, as nearly the entire burden of his education falls upon the whites, who can adopt such methods as they choose. The apathy which has greeted the failure of the Blair Bill among those who have made a special study of the negro's intellectual, ethical, and industrial needs can be accounted for by the fact that absolute race equality in development and treatment is one of its fundamental recognitions and requirements. They regard its theory that literacy, or intellectual culture, is the equivalent of ethical culture, as absolutely false ; and its foundation principle of intellectual, ethical, religious, and technical equality, as not only erroneous, but calamitous and destructive to the true educational interests of the negro race. They believe that by an adherence to these theories, and to exclusively intellectual methods in education, we are blindly repeating upon this continent the mistake in Christian evangelization made for four hundred years upon the African continent ; a mistake which, from the failure of Christian nations and individuals to practically recognize the differences in racial capacity and development, and the axiom that higher ideals are assimilated only in the ratio of that development and capacity with the ideals presented, has made Mohammedanism the great and increasing power in Africa, and pushed Christianity to the wall. They believe that the course adopted with the Western African and the Southern negro is a repetition of the mistake made with Kaspar Hauser, the strange creature who appeared in Nuremberg in the early part of this century. "The masters who proffered to teach him to speak, began by dissertations on the formation of language, while the pastors who sought to teach him religion, began with such abstruse principles as that God had neither form or substance, and that He had created all things out of nothing," with the final result "that all notions of redemption and atonement, and of that Saviour whose love and

pity he so especially claimed," utterly failed to reach his mind. In these opinions they have the support, not only of African travelers and independent observers, but of modern schoolmen, and practical instructors, North and South, of the largest experience, and of both races, as well as of a rapidly increasing *clientèle* formed of all parties and shades of political opinions. It is their hope, in the interest of popular education, that all bills of similar character with the Blair Bill will fail in their passage, in the presence of increased knowledge, newly developed facts, and a more intelligent appreciation of the negro's necessities.

At the "Conference of Educators of Colored Youth," held in Washington March 25 to 27 of the current year, the final paper upon the "Spiritual and Ethical Culture of Afro-American Youth" was read by Rev. Dr. Rankin, the newly elected president of the "Howard University" (colored), in which he put himself in accord with the chief tenet of the "middle ground" namely, that in his present status, the Afro-American has an inferior development to the western Aryan, or Anglo-American, and that "any attempt to make a white man of the negro must utterly fail." The logical sequence of this position is opposition to all educational bills and systems for the negro which do not fundamentally require religious, ethical, and manual, as well as intellectual training. The university and the country are equally to be congratulated upon the presence in the national capital of one who has the courage to act upon his convictions, and to start out fearlessly upon the path which will ultimately lead to the solution of the negro educational problem.

*George R. Stetson.*

WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

#### MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

OF the multitudes who daily wander through this vast storehouse of things curious and rare, few will agree with respect to the objects they can best recollect. The winged monsters of Nimrod's gallery, mythic men and beasts, impress some memories as if with the broad seals of old empires cut in rock. Others will remember the mummies of Egypt, the sarcophagi of Thebes, the mausoleum of Artemis, and the marbles of Athens. Art students will call to mind Hellenic pottery, Roman reliefs, and Greek

sculpture; while antiquities of every sort will be recalled by those who are interested in the life and manners of a world that was old in the East before the West was discovered.

In the midst of so many spoils from the old kingdoms, it is sometimes forgotten that this great treasure-house was designed originally for memorials of a different kind from these in bronze and stone; and, though less imposing or cumbersome, they are none the less valuable and interesting to the antiquarian and historian. To be sure, the substances on which their story is written are not so enduring as the other; but for this reason the care with which they are preserved is the greater. So that it may be asserted with truth that the original design of the founders of the Museum was to provide a suitable place for the preservation of perishable memorials which, for any reason, have a permanent value. Among these, manuscripts hold the principal place.

The history of the institution lends authority to this statement. As early as the year 1700, a collection of manuscripts made by Sir Robert Bruce Cotton was presented to the English nation by his grandson. With a promptitude that has characterized other recognitions, Parliament took notice of the gift fifty-three years afterward. However, when the government did at last rouse itself to a sense of the value of the documents, it atoned for the half century's delay by making an appropriation worthy of the Sibylline leaves that the age had in its keeping. In 1753 an act of Parliament was passed "for the purchase of the museum or collection of Sir Hans Sloane and of the Harleian collection of manuscripts, and for providing one General Repository for the better reception and more convenient use of said collections and of the Cottonian library and of the additions thereto." This library, formed by Sir Robert Cotton near the beginning of the seventeenth century, contained manuscripts, Biblical, historical, and literary, belonging to the early and Middle Ages, and was especially rich in English literature, monastic records, and state papers.

In accordance with this act of Parliament, Montagu House in Bloomsbury was purchased in 1754, and for nearly ninety years it held the collections enumerated in the act of incorporation. Their growth compelled the erection of a larger building, and by the year 1845 four sides of the present edifice had been completed. And by 1879, out of the purpose to build a fitting shrine for the perishable materials of history, had grown the imposing pile in Russell Square, with the various departments that have been added to those originally contemplated.

Around the manuscripts as a nucleus gathered first their immediate successors, the block-printed books; then the type-printed and the stereotyped, nearly two million volumes in all. Standing at the centre of the circular room, whose walls are lined with these books, with rows of desks for 460 readers radiating from the librarian's station, one will best apprehend to what Sir John Cotton's gift has grown since the year 1700.

It is the manuscripts, however, as the germ of the vast collection, that have the chief interest; and to but a few of these, out of the fifty thousand already accumulated, can attention now be given. They will relate, for the most part, to the history and literature of England.

Of these there is one which has an absorbing interest for descendants of the Saxons the world over, — a copy of the *Magna Charta* bearing the seal of King John. Considered as a manuscript, it is venerable with an age of six and three quarters centuries, having survived many misfortunes, notably the fire of 1731, by which it was so much damaged as to be almost illegible. Fortunately, one of the hundred or more contemporary copies that were issued has survived to be an interpreter of this one bearing the royal seal; and the text in Latin, as well as an English translation, are not difficult to find. As a piece of pen-printing, done two hundred years before Caxton was born, it reveals the work of the pioneer of English typography. The small black-letter has the neatness and precision that belong to an adept in the engrossing art. The lines are as even as type could make them, disfigured only by the sloping dash, which gives an undue prominence to the letter "d," and by a curious mixture of mitres, gates, and gridirons standing for capitals. The numerous marks of contraction show that the copyist had a keen sense of the value of time, or of his own labor, hardly to be looked for in so important a document. Possibly the large edition to be distributed throughout the kingdom hastened and abbreviated the work. In spite, however, of the modern and more legible versions, antiquarian interest will fasten upon the shriveled parchment and the fragment of the seal remaining. Associations cluster around the dusky page that are among the noblest in the nation's life, and make its trial by fire fifty years ago seem in harmony with its origin in the stormy times when it was wrung from unwilling despotism. Sole survivor of the successive concessions which royalty has made to the people, it is revered by them as the monument of their freedom and the foundation of their liberty.

For this reason the lost charters which mark their progressive steps towards this one are sometimes overlooked in their adoration of this smoky parchment which they can see with their eyes and touch with their hands. As manuscripts they can, of course, claim no notice here; but without having them in mind, the Great Charter itself becomes as anomalous and inexplicable as the pillared circle of Stonehenge. Lest, therefore, its isolation lead to a veneration of it as a trophy of the first victory of popular rights over royal prerogative, the tradition of former and also of subsequent advances should be cherished, the documentary evidence of which has been buried with the ashes of monastery, castle, and palace in a soil which is five fathom deep with history. The Great Charter, instead of being considered a sudden growth of a low-born jealousy of kings' encroachments, may be regarded as a clear definition of rights of which the Saxon was always conscious, and as a plain and positive declaration of them, which nearly a thousand years of national life and experience at last enabled him to make. In earlier times, at home in Jutland and Sleswick, he cut down the pretensions of an intruder on his personal rights in rougher and shorter ways. The sharp sword and the biting war-bill quieted the aspersions of the over-ambitious thane who had not been lifted up on the free shoulders of his countrymen. Centuries of semi-civilization in a milder climate, where the declining empire had left its lessons of luxury, modified this spirit somewhat, but did not extirpate it; and all that was needed to give it occasional and national expression was sufficient provocation. It was in the state as in the church. There was submission to the papacy, but under protests that were frequent enough to show that British Christianity was conscious of its own continuous life and of its right to order its own affairs independent of aliens, — a conviction that defined itself clearly at the Reformation. In like manner the Anglican sense of human rights found its definite statement in *Magna Charta*, — which sums up the steps that popular liberty had gained from time to time in successive protests against royal usurpation. A few landmarks will indicate the strides of the English towards an outspoken declaration of their rights. The protests were mild at first, but very effective. For instance, when Ethelred the Redeless pushed the pretensions of the crown to their utmost limit and attempted to cut loose from the nation's leaders by setting the barons aside, the people in turn kept aloof from him in the day of his necessity when pirate bands beset the coast; and the king,

left to defend his island single-handed, was forced to flee to Normandy. Later on the protest took another form, when the people paid loyal tribute to the good laws of the Confessor, demanding their enforcement rather than permitting a ready license, anticipating the doctrine of the best liberty as being dependent upon wise restraint. It was these laws that a century later were embodied in a more definite form, — the first written Charter of Liberties, issued by Henry I. and confirmed in the Charter of Henry II. Thus side by side with the growth of monarchy are found plain and plainer statements that kings exist not so much for their own as for the nation's advantage. The expression of this Anglican sense of rights, though differing with the exigencies of the times, always amounted to the same thing, and was kept up with a pertinacity characteristic of the race until it took shape in this charter which is rightly termed the Great.

We can see how they stuck to their ideals of freedom in wresting this charter from John. They toiled at it for twenty months. First there was the meeting at St. Albans in August of 1213, when the representatives of all England came together under the leadership of Langton — the first national council — to consider what demands had best be made. Already Langton had sworn the king to observe the laws of Edward the Confessor, and to grant the people their traditional liberties; in addition he now promised good government and observance of the laws of Henry I. At a subsequent meeting in St. Paul's Cathedral, Henry's charter was produced, and on its basis another fuller and stronger in its provisions was drawn up and proposed for John's ratification. He managed to delay his answer for a year. Again the barons met, this time at Bury St. Edmunds, and swore upon the high altar that they would compel the king to confirm the charter or bide the issues of war; and early in January, 1215, they appeared in arms to lay their demands before him. He put them off until Easter, hoping to gain time to defeat their purpose by half concessions. When the time expired, the nobles gathered again, backed by two thousand armed knights, and having in their hands the "Articles of Liberties," an enumeration of their demands to be granted in Magna Charta. Driven to the last ditch, John could do nothing but request them to name the day and place for ratification. "Let the day be the 15th of June and the place Runnymede," was the ready answer. Among the historic scenes which military painters have depicted there is none more significant to the Anglican race than this one. On one bank of the



Thames near Windsor were encamped the barons; on the opposite bank the king; while an island in the stream formed the neutral ground for the meeting of their respective deputies. There the Great Charter was agreed to in a single day, and English liberty had once more asserted itself, this time in terms so plain and full that it was considered sufficient merely to reaffirm its provisions during many subsequent reigns. Ratified six times by John's successor and twenty-four times since the death of Henry III., it holds its place at the head of the statutes of the realm until this day; and may, therefore, be regarded as the cornerstone of the British Constitution.

There will always be various estimates of the relative value of Magna Charta in the series of declarations by which the Anglo-Saxon race has expressed its sense of human rights. To the common opinion regarding it as the basis of later English liberty, there will be some to take exception. Otherwise, and as in other demurrers, wisdom would not be the property of those who dissent. At the lowest estimate it was a reassertion of principles that were once in force but had been violated and obliterated by a hundred and fifty years of Norman rule. The system of absolutism introduced into England by the Conqueror and his successors was modified, to say the least, by the demands of a baronial aristocracy for themselves and, eventually, for the lower orders. With the death of John, despotism began to die. Moreover, it marks the definite recognition of the popular voice in government where the royal mandate had been supreme since the Conquest, and also indicates the reappearance of the Saxon element which had been suppressed by the Norman. An illustrative parallel is found in the struggle of the two languages for supremacy and in the final issue of it. Race distinctions are merged at last in one nationality, and although class distinctions were not so readily overcome, because the villain was farther removed from the baron than Saxon from Norman, the villain was not henceforth to be deprived of his implements of husbandry when amerced for crime. Even the serfs, forgotten at first, came at length within the benefit of the Charter when villanage disappeared and they rose into the condition of freemen. A great step had been taken, and life, liberty, and property acquired a new sacredness. Shall it be said, rather, that the old sacredness was affirmed and emphasized to be reaffirmed or restated from time to time as despotism forgot the latent sense of freedom in the popular mind? These repeated confirmations and reaffirmations in after ages are

the clearest evidence that there was something in its provisions that went beyond the meeting of existing evils by practical and present remedies. As the barons would not attempt to secure the welfare of their own order without including others, so they could not confine their work to their own age, whether mindful or not of posterity; and what succeeding generations did with their heritage is the best witness to its prospective character. Thus the Charter became, also, the forerunner of subsequent declarations down to our own in 1776. And thus is completed its twofold character, prospective as well as retrospective. Like Numa's Janus of the New Year, it contemplates with one face the experiences of the past, and with the other looks down a future full of larger hope and greater promise. Having its beginning in the free fields of Angle-land, and keeping its vigor on British soil, it contains the germs of a better freedom in after ages and in other lands. It is said that there was a vigorous yew tree standing on the bank of the Thames when the "army of God and Holy Church," as the barons called their embattled host, assembled to extort justice from John; and, after six hundred and seventy-five years, their descendants gather beneath its shadow. May there not be seen in the "Ankerwike Yew" an emblem of the Great Charter there established, whose principles had long been rooted in English soil, and whose outgrowth shelters generations remote in time and dwelling-place?

It is remarkable that a manuscript of such interest as *Magna Charta* should have as a companion the "Articles of Liberties," mentioned above as the schedule of demands made upon King John and embodied in his Grant. Being the framework of the Great Charter itself, what has been said of the history and appearance of that manuscript will apply to this. Together they constitute the documentary and monumental witness to what was, perhaps, the most momentous act in the nation's life, and amidst the loss of so much manuscript material it is singular that these two should have escaped destruction.

There are other charters here, in the primary meaning of the term, signifying grants of privilege or of estates, as when the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem surrendered to the Bishop of Winchester the Hospital of St. Cross; or as the document by which two friars, as proctors of Pope Alexander V., grant certain indulgences to "Sir William Fitz Hugh, Knight, and Margery his wife, in consideration of their contributions towards refortifying the castle of St. Peter at Budrun, lately cap-

tured from the infidels," bearing the date of A. D. 1414. Another is the Bull of Pope Eugenius IV., granting permission to the officials of Eton College to lease their lands; dated at Florence, A. D. 1445. A more interesting manuscript from the Vatican is that Bull of Leo X. which conferred on Henry the Eighth the title of Defender of the Faith, in 1551. There is somewhat of theological fitness in the fact that that manuscript has been considerably damaged by fire. There is one article, however, that was not so easily injured by the conflagration of 1731 in the Cottonian Library, and that is the "Roundel of Copper," nine and one half inches in circumference, said to be the model of tonsure of the clergy of St. Paul's, London. Why it should be among the charters is not plain, unless by reason of certain privileges and indulgences that were granted when the copper cap covered the shaven crown of the ecclesiastic.

From the charters, great and small, it is natural to turn next to what are called the Historical Manuscripts. In this department fate appears to have been very indiscriminating in preserving some and in letting others go into oblivion. An instance of this is seen in number one of this class. Historically considered, it is as unimportant as it well could be — hardly worth saving. It relates to the overmuch governing of a boy who had more need of right training and education than of restraint and repression. Left when an infant to the inheritance of the English throne by the death of his father, the child, Henry VI., received also the legacy of too many governors and tutors. Their multitude was considered to be the best substitute for the departed valor and wisdom of the hero of Agincourt. Warwick, the companion and confidant of Henry V., was wisely chosen, no doubt, to have charge of the royal boy, but it may be doubted if his wisdom needed supplementing by two dukes, three earls, and five bishops. Yet in two years after the boy's coronation, he being now eleven years old, the great Warwick deems it desirable to appeal to the above-mentioned potentates, composing the council of the realm, to sustain him in the exercise of such discipline as was then thought proper for the making of a king. The council's answer to his appeal has been preserved in this manuscript, entitled "Articles for the goode Reule, demesnyng, and seuretee of ye kynges persone and draught of him to vertue," etc. The fourth of these Articles is to the effect that as the king's growth in years and stature and knowledge of his royal authority "cause him more and more to grucche with chastising and to loathe it," the earl

begs the council to support him in the correction of his kingly pupil, and to bear him scatheless against his anger at such treatment. There seems to be a remarkable unanimity in the Council's resolve that they "will firmly assist the noble earl in chastising the boy king for his defaults that for awe thereof he forbear the more to do amiss and intend the more busily to vertue and to learning," and, moreover, they will "come to the king and declare their assent to his chastisement." Poor dukes and earls and bishops! It was the first time that the English had been obliged to bring up their sovereign, and they made bungling work of it. If the son of Henry V. ever did show enough of the Plantagenet fire to give the earl so much trouble, it died out of him, or was beaten out, long before he came into his kingdom as king supreme. And if the sense of his rightful position failed him in later years, it may possibly be owing to the over-fidelity of his guardians, and to the cast-iron methods of the time. His life was a continuous pupilage; and while historians assign to heredity or some other equally responsible agency his infirmity of purpose, fear of responsibility, and general weakness of character, they pass over this piece of parchment, which ought to stand as an everlasting apology for Henry VI. — the much-governed king. It is fortunate for posterity that religious precepts were among the things which Earl Beauchamp conscientiously tried to instill into his royal ward. This at least might not have been accomplished by the same disciplinary method; and it is to his credit that the king displayed a devotion which for a long time caused him to be regarded as a saint. It is one of the historical compensations that, in spite of the weakness of his will, and the inglorious record of a reign of suffering rather than doing, being dethroned and restored with the varying fortunes of York and Lancaster, the memory of "Holy Henry's shade" is perpetuated in two monuments which will outlast the memorials of mightier sovereigns. These are King's College at Cambridge, and Eton beneath the royal towers of Windsor, an institution that is likely to survive all royalty in England.

Near this record of an attempt to make a worthy king of the boy Henry is a letter of a man who attempted to make himself king and to sit on the throne occupied by Henry VII. It was not the first nor the last instance of a high aim in life according to the standards of the Middle Ages. That the aspirant was not related to any royal house of the time would have been no impassable bar to success, if other conditions had been favorable.

But to rest a claim to the crown upon a facial resemblance to the Plantagenet family was a bit of assumption in the Flemish Jew, Perkin Warbeck, that would have done credit to a usurper with royal blood in his veins. This letter, which he wrote to Barnard de la Force, Knight, at Fontarabia, in Spain, four years after Columbus sailed from Palos, is in the same assuming mood. It was sent from Edinburgh, and must have been written after his marriage to the beautiful Lady Catherine Gordon, as he was with James IV. on a raid toward London, where he hoped to be proclaimed king and crowned as Richard IV. In this letter he desires the worthy knight to be his "counsellour and friend as he had been to his father, Edward IV."! and in anticipation of his coming kingship subscribes himself, "Your friend Richard off England." It may be remarked, in passing, that in the majority of these old manuscripts there is not much to choose between the orthography of kings and pretenders, of nobles and commons. It was that golden age of letters when every man did that which was right in his own eyes, and lost no time in consulting authorities. Perkin, the Pretender, could take as many liberties with his *j*'s in the above extract as Henry V., every inch a king, could take with the alphabet in general when he wrote in a manuscript near by: "Wherefore I wolle that the Duc of Orlians be kept stille within the castil of Pontfret with owte goying to Robertis place or to any other disport: for it is bettre that he lak his disport than we were deceived." There is certainly no dissimulation in the king's letter.

The manner in which Warbeck played his part entitles him to a prominent place among the usurpers of that grasping age; and if the native greed of the Scots for plunder had not disgusted his Yorkist adherents, England might have had a specimen of nature's noblemen on the throne who would have outshone the fourth James and the seventh Henry — the two traders who sold him out to their common advantage. He had not lacked efficient backing by the nobility, led on by the old Duchess of Burgundy, nor did he want a precedent for probable success in gulling the populace in the matter of resemblance to royalty. An Oxford baker's son had personated the Earl of Warwick so well that he had carried all Ireland under the title of Edward VI., anticipating the real monarch's reign by fifty-eight years.

The sixth Edward is himself represented in this collection by his signature to a document which marks the first clear division between Romanism and Protestantism in England. His father's

Protestant proclivities were, of course, largely dependent upon matters not strictly religious. He was a defender of matrimonial honor as well as of the faith, and Protestantism assisted him in the great purpose of his later days. But it was Edward who placed himself abreast of the reformatory movement at the head of the reforming party. Accordingly, in the third year of his reign, he placed his signature at the top of this manuscript, ordering the Bishops to "collect, deface, and abolish all Roman Catholic service-books." In another place is displayed a "Treatise on the Sacrament," by the same king, in his handwriting and bearing the date A. D. 1549. Two years before he wrote a different sort of a document, which may be seen among the Autographs, being a passport for three ambassadors from Germany to return home with their "sixteen servants, six horses, money, plate, jewels, and all other their bagges and baggages." It appears by this that the word "luggage" was not always king's English for what a traveler carries.

Mention of the Reformation recalls a Latin letter which Erasmus wrote to Nicholas Everard, President of Holland, dated Basle, December, 1525, on the subject of Luther's marriage, of which the following extract is significant of the writer's attitude toward the whole movement: "In Comedy commotions generally end in matrimony. The Lutheran Tragedy seems about to have a similar ending. He has taken a wife — the monk, a nun. Now he begins to be more quiet; nor does he longer rage with his pen."

By the side of this is a letter from Luther himself to Thomas Cromwell, Henry the Eighth's Secretary of State, apologizing for not replying to his letter on account of the sudden departure of the messenger. He rejoices in Cromwell's zeal for the cause reformatory, and in his power to advance it. That Cromwell's zeal was certainly taking a German direction encouraging to Luther is shown by the pains he took that Henry should be favorably impressed with the Dutch Ann of Cleves. But the portrait that preceded her to England and captivated the king was more beautiful than the reality proved to be, and the disgusted monarch vented his wrath for such intermeddling of Protestantism with matrimony — not this time upon the wife — but upon Cromwell himself, whose head rolled from the block as the first step toward divorce, and as an indication of the prompt business habits of the king.

A letter lying near this one is dated the previous year, addressed



to Henry VIII., and subscribed, "Most devoted to your royal Majesty, Melancthon." It expresses admiration of his talents and virtue. Why not? His talents have seldom been disputed, and the other quality cannot so easily be disproved as shown to have had an eccentric method of guarding itself.

In this connection, there is something pitiful in the brown sheet written over in a school-girl hand, so precise in its spacing that black lines may have been laid underneath. It is addressed to Cardinal Wolsey, in the days of his prosperity, by Anne Boleyn, asking his aid in furthering her prospects with the king. She thanks him for the great pain and travail that he has taken to bring to pass the greatest wealth that is possible to come to any creature living, and promises that after this matter is brought to pass, "you shall find me as I am bound to your service; and then look what thing in this world I can imagine to do you pleasure in, you shall find me the gladdest woman in the world to do it." But she was another person toward the Cardinal later on, when she dined with the king at Grafton, and from her repeated attempts to prejudice him against Wolsey, Henry himself was forced to say, "Why, I perceive ye are not the Cardinal's friend."

Still more pitiful is that letter which Anne wrote as his wife to the king on the eve of her execution, full of worship for his majesty, but firm in its assertion of her own innocence: "Trye me, good king, but let me have a lawful tryall and open; for my truth shall feare no open shame." But her removal was determined beyond the power of letters and juries, for Henry had his eyes already upon Jane Seymour, and the wedding was to be celebrated the next morning after Anne Boleyn's body was laid in St. Peter's-in-the-Tower.

Henry VIII. himself is represented here by a letter to Wolsey, written ten years earlier, when the latter was "myne owne good Cardinall," passing his time, according to Cavendish, "from day to day and from year to year in great wealth and joy and triumph and glory, having always on his side the king's especial aid and favor." And in one of these years of his splendor, when he was trying to steer England between France and Spain in their scramble for Germany, he received this cordial epistle from his king, written in a round, rolling hand, that is symbolic of his rollicking majesty in the year 1518: —

"I recomande me unto yow with all my hart and thanke yow for the grette payne and labour that yow do dayly take in my bysynes and maters desyryng yow (that wen yow have well es-

tablyssed them) to take summe pastyme and comfort to the intente yow may the longer endure to serve us for allways payne cannott be induryd, etc. Wryttyn with the hand off your lovyng master,

"HENRY R."

It is pleasant to recall the fact that the Cardinal at this time had abundant facilities for taking "pastyme and comfort;" but there came a day when his loving master could spare him the time better than the means for so doing.

One or two other manuscripts belonging to the Reformation period have an especial interest as survivors of more important documents. For instance, a letter of recommendation of the bearer as schoolmaster, addressed to Farel by Calvin, is the only relic of a voluminous correspondence with that co-worker. Close, cramped, with lines curved as if written with the elbow for a pivot, it is the work of a man who valued paper more than labor, as might be expected from the author of the "Institutes," and editor of the four editions already published.

From Geneva we are carried back to London by the rex manuscript and to Sir Thomas More's "pore house in Chelsea," which Erasmus has immortalized. Here the great chancellor wrote in a clear, angular hand the following sentences to the king, who had already cast an evil eye upon him. Referring to his recent escape from the charge of treason which had been maliciously raised against him out of the ravings of the Maid of Kent, he writes: "Ye were so good and gracious unto me as to discharge and disburden me, giving me license to bestow the residue of my life in myn age now to come about the provision of my sowle;" and he prays, "that of your accustomed goodness no sinistre information may move you to have any more distrust of my truth and devotion." But if the king should believe him guilty, he is ready to forfeit his fortune and his life; his compensation being that he should "meet the king in heaven and there be merry with him." It is as hard to understand the cheerful anticipation of the chancellor as his abject devotion. But it was the mode of the time. Parliaments rose and bowed to his vacant chair when the king's name was spoken, and his victims blessed him with their last breath.

When so many manuscripts have perished which were written by sovereigns who reigned a score or more years, it is singular that even the signature of "the nine days' queen" should be preserved. In Beauchamp Tower it is simply "Jane," cut upon the wall; but at the top of this order to levy forces "for the subduing

of certain tumults and rebellions against us and our crown" is the full title of "Jane the Queen." This assumption of authority sounds more like Northumberland than the timid lady who was the unfortunate object of Edward's choice as his successor, or rather the victim of his prejudice against his "half-blood sisters," Mary and Elizabeth. But the British axe was hewing out the succession on straight lines, and inconvenient branches had to be lopped off. The letter in Greek which the unhappy lady wrote to her sister the day before her execution would have been a much more appropriate memorial of her brief reign, as are the lines addressed to the Lieutenant of the Tower, in the handwriting of Lady Jane, on the margin of a small Manual of Prayers, used by her on the scaffold and now shown in the collection of royal manuscripts.

Of the woman who signed her death-warrant, and so many others that she earned a sanguinary title, there is a reminder here not at all in keeping with the murderous mood by which she is best known. An old chronicler intimates that a gentler passion was as strong in her as her fanatic zeal for the faith. Perhaps the crossing of the one had much to do with the outbursts of the other. But these were her brightest days when she wrote MS. 41, being "Instructions for my lorde privesel," who was going down to Southampton to receive her dear Philip of Spain, to whom she is to be married on the 25th July. "Fyrste to tell the Kynge," she writes, "the whole state of this Realme with all thynges appartaynyng to the same as myche as ye knowe to be trewe;" with second and third particulars respecting obeying and advising him, and signed, "Marye the Queene." Possibly the noble lord did not tell Philip, as they came riding up to Winchester in the rain, on the 23d, that when the London boys heard of the marriage treaty made in the previous winter, they pelted with snowballs the retinue of Egmont, the ambassador who negotiated it, and struck up their game of English and Spaniards, in which the unlucky wight who personated Philip was hanged by his comrades and came near losing his life in the earnestness of the game. The boys, however, only voiced the general sentiment, which wedding feasts, pageants, and twenty cars of Spanish silver did not greatly change. But Mary would not have been her father's child if she had suffered people or Parliament to thwart her choice of a husband. To keep him was another matter, in which she found even her own royalty powerless, when thirteen months later Philip found that he could not live with dignity in the country "on

account of the insolence with which foreigners are treated by the English."

The letter in French (MS. 42) which Elizabeth wrote to the King of France — Charles IX., of the St. Bartholomew massacre notoriety — is insignificant as compared with some of her misssives that have been lost. It is a gracious acknowledgment of her willingness to favor the king's views in spite of his disregard of her requests. As a specimen of the queen's French, the closing sentence may be given: "Vous voyes par la que la necessitie qui vous presse s'advance beaucoup au devant de mes propres affaires, faysant paroistre que suis meilleur Sœur que Royne, et que je oublie que la Charite doit commencer par soy."

There is a proclamation which bears her signature in bold perpendicular letters, with an additional flourish that might be taken for an embroidery pattern for its intricacy. The queen was deeply stirred on the subject of this proclamation, for she had in mind the hostile intentions of the House of Guise and its influence with Mary Queen of Scots. It was too early to charge the great apprehension of her reign upon her sister, although this politico-religious question had already taken unpleasant hold upon her fears. Accordingly, she more than intimates that Mary's pretensions to the crown are inspired by the Catholic party in France, and are not of her own devising. But twenty-eight years of brooding over the dangerous possibility of exchanging places with Mary Stuart, accompanied by untoward events in the realm, helped her at last to set this name, "ELIZABETH R." to her sister's death-warrant. It would be interesting to examine that specimen of her handwriting, to detect any possible symptoms of compunction or desperation which she is claimed to have had — the claim resting on her wrath against the ministers who were made the scapegoats of her act. Or, after all, was the signature forged by Walsingham's clerk? And if so, was it beyond Elizabeth's duplicity to connive at the forgery?

It is fitting that the unfortunate Mary of Scotland, who seldom had her will in her lifetime, should have her last will and testament kept in these archives. The original draft, in the handwriting of her secretary, but with corrections and many additions in that of the queen herself, bears the date of Sheffield Manor in Yorkshire, February, 1577. She had been in charge of the Earl of Shrewsbury, acting as host for Elizabeth, about eight years, and was now detained at one of the earl's castles, overlooking the famous cutlery town before the tilt-hammer had

made it a city. An unromantic place for the writing of a document linked with a life full of romance; but Buxton and Workworth, Chatsworth and Winfield and Chartley, and, last and saddest, Fotheringay, were other stations of her progress of nineteen years in captivity, toward the block and the axe.

On the day her death sentence was published in London, her son, James VI., wrote from Holyrood to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, congratulating him on his absence from England at the time of the "pretendit condemnation" of Mary Queen of Scots, and desiring him to exert his influence that "the rest of the tragedy be unperfytid." This manuscript has a twofold interest when it is remembered that Elizabeth had offered her Leicester to Mary for a husband, which was regarded as an insult by the latter and also that James himself was in this hour of her peril a most unfilial son, whose anxiety to join the English throne to that of Scotland was greater than his desire to save his mother from her doom.

It is therefore highly consistent that he should be the author of the royal manuscript "Instructions for the Prince" Henry his son, in which, no doubt, he insists upon filial love and obedience. At any rate, either his father's instruction or the abilities, promise, and character of the prince, whose early death was a genuine grief to the nation, made that nation's misfortune seem all the greater when his younger brother, Charles I., came into power. For his military tastes might have turned the war spirit of the people across the Channel, instead of letting it break out at home in the strifes of the Revolution.

To Charles his father sends a letter which is interesting in many ways. The youth had persuaded his royal sire to allow him, contrary to the custom of the time, to present himself in person to his lady-love, Henrietta Maria, daughter of the King of Spain. Negotiations being unduly prolonged, by delay of the Pope's dispensation, James gets uneasy, and writes (in MS. 43),

"My dearest sonne, I sent you commandment long agoe not to loose tyme quhaiere ye are; but ather to bring quikelie hoame youre mistresse quiche is my earnist desyre; but if no bettir maye be, rather then to linger any longer thaire, to come without her. . . . And thairfor I charge you to come quikelie ather with her or without her. I know youre love to her person hath enforcid you to delaye the putting in execucion of my former commandement, but . . . ye muste praeferre the obedience to a father to the love ye carrie to a mistresse. And so God blesse you.

"JAMES R."

It will be remembered that the prince had to go home without Henrietta, and to wait two years until he could renew his suit as King Charles I.

When, twenty-one years later, he wrote MS. 44 to Prince Rupert, his fortunes had changed. For nineteen years he had been a too faithful follower of his father's doctrines about royal prerogative, until the turbulent element in the nation was in arms against him. Cooped up at Oxford in the spring of 1644, with a Cavalier Parliament of his own, somewhat discouraged and prognosticating evil for himself in the coming campaign, he writes to his rash nephew in a tone which shows a dejected spirit, thanking him for the freedom of his remarks in his last letter, and concluding: "It is lykely that your Brother Maurice army shall joyne with this; now to avoid disputes I desyre to know if you think it nott fit that I should declare your Brother, in your absence Generall of my Horse." Five weeks later, the impetuous Rupert had precipitated the battle of Marston Moor, and his troops in the hour of victory, too busy with plundering, lost the day to Cromwell and his Ironsides.

Three other manuscripts of the king's are to be seen, two of which relate to the impeachment of the Five Members and one in cipher about plans for his escape from Carisbrooke castle, the year before his execution. A proof of his wife's devotion remains in a cipher letter to the king respecting a supply of ammunition which she had purchased abroad by the sale of her jewels.

As we get into the middle of the seventeenth century, manuscripts become more abundant. The whole of Charles Second's speech to the House of Commons on the 1st of March, 1661, can be seen in his own handwriting. It was the year of the Restoration, just after the quelling of the mad tumult raised by Thomas Venner and his Fifth Monarchy men.

In the midst of this array of royal chirography is a letter of Oliver Cromwell to his wife, referring to various members of his family, written from Edinburgh, 12th April, 1651.

One by William Prynne opens up the whole biography of a man whose opinions changed often enough to keep him in opposition to whatever party happened to be in power. Shifting like a weathercock, he was always facing the storm: sometimes Laud, again Cromwell; losing his ears a second time after they had once been sewed on. It is in keeping with a temper that was always getting lost to demand in this letter to Fairfax: "What kinde of a Prisoner am I, and whose?" This time it was for



denying the supremacy of Parliament and because he would not indorse its condemnation of the king. Finally, he was so zealous for the Restoration that Charles made him keeper of the records in the Tower.

The next manuscripts of importance are three by William of Orange, prince and king. As prince there is one announcing his landing with troops at Torbay and his intention of marching on Exeter. And another, a month later, contains directions in regard to the Dutch fleet that brought his army over. In the following March, after his proclamation as William III. of England, he wrote the "Instructions to Admiral Herbert for the disposal of the late King James II., in case of his capture at sea." Dated Whitehall, 16 March, 1688.

It is in correspondence with the change in the ideas that rule the world that manuscripts of the greatest interest for the last two centuries are those of literary celebrities. All four of the Georges are, indeed, given a sort of immortality by indifferent samples which were apparently written with a stick, that of George III. being a paragraph written out by himself for insertion in his first speech from the throne, beginning: "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Britain," etc.: the House of Hanover was getting acclimated by 1760. And it is an evidence of the worshipful loyalty of the British to-day that they have placed beside the writings of old kings and queens the first attempt of Princess Victoria at writing her name "in pencil at the age of four years;" but in spite of these tracings of recent royalty, those which belong to the commonwealth of letters attract the greatest attention.

This is true in a measure of times preceding William III. Contemporary with some of the manuscripts that have been mentioned are others which have been oftener printed and will be more widely known, as Sir Francis Bacon's famous "Memorandum Book," written as if for his eye alone; and Ben Jonson's autograph copy of the "Masque of Queenes" in an almost microscopic hand; and Tasso's "Torrismondo," in irregular characters and faded ink. Shakespeare left only his autograph and seal on a mortgage deed of a dwelling-house in Blackfriars, and Spenser a grant in his handwriting of the custody of the woods of Ballynagin, county of Cork; and John Milton, his signature to the Articles of Agreement between himself and his publisher for the sale of the copyright of a "Poem intituled Paradise Lost," for fifteen pounds sterling. Camden, Donne, Jeremy Taylor, and

Pepys have letters here, but no histories, or poems, or sermons, or diurnal gossip; but Baxter's "Narrative" and George Fox's "Explanation of Arone's linen breeches" throw light on the Long Parliament and Old Testament patterns. Richardson's letter defending the compromise between Sir Charles Grandison and Clementina in the article of religion is a leaf from an old literary controversy, and Sterne writes to his publisher about the sale of "Tristram Shandy." An "Agreement," never fulfilled, attests to the uncertain ways of Oliver Goldsmith, and Samuel Johnson answers an invitation on a card, which, of course, is inclosed in an accompanying note of Boswell's, who, faithful to his idol even in things polite, "regrets that so agreeable a meeting must be deferred till next year." Garrick complains of a criticism on Bates' farce, "The Blackamoor Washed White," and Kemble desires Ireland to send him the play of "Vortigern." Gray is fortunate in the preservation of a fair copy of the "Elegy," and Burns has here the song, "Here's a Health to Them That's awa," in a hand that is like the song, but steady yet. Keats writes concerning some verses which "can be struck out in no time," for Haydon, the painter; and Shelley, in angular characters, tells Miss Curran that he has nearly finished his "Cenci." S. T. Coleridge, in the letter to Basil Montague, discourses of the doctrines of Edward Irving; and William Wordsworth, in the chirography of a man who approves of himself, informs a friend of the benefit he has received from the application of "Blue Stone" to his eyes. Charles Lamb lives here in his letter to John Clare, written in a pale, even, and clerkly hand, thanking him for a present of his poems, criticizing his provincialisms, and sweetening his criticism with a recipe for cooking frogs, — "the nicest little rabbity things you ever tasted." Sydney Smith answers an attack by Sir Robert Peel, and Thomas Hood writes to E. Bulwer Lytton about an article written by the latter for his magazine. Theodore Hook writes a humorous letter to Baylis in answer to a complaint about the killing of a cat by his servant; and Lord Lytton, with the pen of a ready writer, writes his first letter after his elevation to the peerage. Of the latest date is the letter, with down-running lines in blue ink, written by Charles Dickens, the day before his death, to Charles Kent, appointing to meet him on the morrow: "I may be ready for you at three o'clock. If I can't be — why then I sha'n't be," and finished in a jocular vein.

Letters on indifferent matters are here from other men of note,

from Addison, Steele, Pope, Dryden, and Swift. And mentioned with those of the kings should be that of George Washington, then a colonel in his majesty's service, and that of Napoleon Bonaparte, written before the meagre hospitalities of England were pressed upon him at St. Helena. To the reader of Early English a copy of *Beowulf* will have an interest, written on vellum about the year 1000, and another of the "*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*." So, also, will the autograph copy of Dan Michel's "*Ayenbite of Inwit*," as well as one of "*Piers Plowman*," written before 1400. Three fifteenth-century copies of different works of Chaucer are a memorial of the poet whose demure, contemplative countenance is depicted in the margin of Oocleve's "*De Regimine Principum*."

Preceding these early English manuscripts are those of older Europe and Asia and the Orient, which are invaluable treasures to scholars from every nation: manuscripts in Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Arabic, and Egyptian characters, engrossed on bark, palm leaves, papyrus, and ivory, in letters of silver and gold, with a wealth of ornamentation belonging to races with which both art and time are long; where results and not haste were the chief concern of the writer, — the industrial as well as the geographical Antipodes of the Western workman with brain and pen. But what can be done with over fifty thousand manuscripts beyond placing a few of the most interesting in their proper historical frames?

In attempting this for some stray English leaves, one is reminded of their likeness to the outcroppings of geologic formations, giving hints of the masses of material buried in successive layers below the surface. But, taken as a series, these fragmentary documents index the making of English literature and liberty from the azoic age of lifeless annals to the alluvial deposits of recent fiction, from the traditions of freedom in the German forests to the Declaration of Rights and a free Parliament. Alfred the Great's "Grant" of land to Liaba, son of Bergwin, with the consent of the Witanagemote, recalls the freeholders' rights in Friesland. Danish occupation and Church possession have their memento in Cnut's "Grant" to Eadsin, bishop, of half a plough of land. Over Saxon law and Dane lawlessness is laid the burden of Norman conquest, keeping uneasy elements in place, whose significant are Stephens' "Confirmation" and "Domesday Book" in the Tower. Magna Charta marks the people's ascendancy in spite of Plantagenet encroachments, and the Reformation Letters their final deliverance from Tudor despotism; while the

third William's "Instructions" announce the downfall of Stuart assumption, and indicate the establishing of constitutional liberty.

What manuscripts shall survive to mark in the far future the character of the conflicts and changes that are now going on with little disturbance, but none the less certainty than in former ages, as to the limits of power on either side, leading to ominous questions concerning the perpetuation of royalty and of the ancient relations between church and state?

*L. Sears.*

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

---

#### THE HEBREW PROPHET AND THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER.

It is said that Charles Reade, whom time is fast exalting to a high place in his department of literature, was led to a study of the Old Testament by a remark of Matthew Arnold. According to my memory, the remark was like this: "The old Bible is getting to be to us literary men of England a sealed book. We may think we know it. We were taught it at home. We heard it read in church. Perhaps we can quote some verse or even passage; but really we know very little of it. I wish, Reade, that you would take up the Old Testament, and go through it as though every page of it were altogether new to you; as though you had never read a line of it before. I think it will astonish you." Well, Reade resolutely put himself into this fresh, eager, zestful reading of the Old Scriptures. The world knows the result. It did more than astonish the great novelist. It regenerated him. The creed he died by, and which, at his request, was chiseled into his tomb-stone in Willesden churchyard, is forever more to be associated with his literary achievements, and is a new and shining witness to the power of God's Word.

What most impressed this man, what begot within him boundless admiration and profoundest moral conviction, was the study of the Old Testament prophets. The majesty and beauty of their utterance enthralled and delighted his intellectual nature. Their superb moral tone, their transcendent spirituality humbled his pride, and won his whole heart and mind to a saving faith in a personal God, and a supernatural Christ. And how could it be otherwise? How upon any ground of merely human history can

one account for these Hebrew prophets? Take them as they pass before us through their many centuries of time. What class of men can be named out of any people or period that can at all be compared to them? They stand alone, unique, unapproachable, and altogether not to be accounted for, only as we accept what they claim for themselves, that "the spirit of the Lord God was upon them"; only as we believe what the Apostle affirmed. "Prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake, being borne away by the Holy Ghost."

The uniformity in the writings and in the characters of these prophets in respect to certain grandest truths, notwithstanding the almost infinite variety of individual temperament, expression, and career, is something wonderful. They belonged to no one caste or circle. Their call was restricted to no hereditary or tribal lines. They represented all sections of the country and every department of life. There were among them warriors, kings, herdsmen, wanderers, women as well as men. They lived on through vast changes in national life, and material and religious conditions; and yet there belonged to these prophets certain characteristics which stamped them all alike, and which make them to stand out among all men as a distinct order of beings. The last representative of this prophetic order appeared just at the time when Rome was beginning its extraordinary career of greatness; when Greece was bursting into its full flower; but among all the heroes which flash out upon us from the records of these mighty people there were none whose patriotism was so pure and lofty as these prophets; whose morality was so severe; whose lives were so unselfish; whose spirit was so fearless; whose hopes were so high and universal. In all that literature has given us, there are no writings by any other men which equal theirs in real genius, in sublimity, grandeur, and tenderness. Nowhere else are there so many imperishable, universal truths, with inspiration and potency in them to hold the faith and shape the lives, as these have for twenty-four centuries, of the wisest and greatest and noblest of the human race. Da Costa well styled these Hebrew prophets "a solar system of men of God."

And they must have been projected into and held within their sweeping orbits by a hand not less almighty than that which hurled and guides the suns and stars along their golden circuits. For they only of all their people resisted those influences which destroyed the integrity of religious faith. They held on from first to last to that simple summary of truths which were origi-

nally revealed, and which embrace all duties to God and to man. Kings and subjects were merging and altogether losing all knowledge and worship of the One, Jehovah God, in the idolatries and unspeakable abominations of the heathen nations about them. The prophets stood like a wall of brass against this sweeping tendency which is always working with such insidious power to make a people sacrifice its most sacred traditions and its ancestral faith to the evil customs and beliefs of other nations. The prophet was always affirming the unity of God and his single government over men. Priests and worshipers were forever falling under that most subtle and obstructive power which enters into all religious forms; which in the very ceremony of worship kills out all the soul of worship. Against this almost irresistible influence which has destroyed the purest religions of man, which at times has sunk even the spiritual religion of Christ into a debasing superstition; against this mere formalism in worship which made these Hebrews to be so observant of rites and yet at times so unconscious of God, the prophet was sometimes almost the only one left to protest. His was the voice to call back priest and people to the simplicity and spirituality of the old and the only religion of God for man: "Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth."

Religion, too, notwithstanding its omnipresence in its rites and observances, prescribing clothes and gesture, and all the outward things of life, had come to be but a complicated machine to be worked by certain men to placate the invisible powers, to avert their anger, or win their power. The human side of religion which comes out so strongly in the Decalogue as seen in the fact that most of its commandments have reference to duties and obligations which relate to a man's conduct towards his fellowmen, — all this was constantly being ignored as the people brought their bulls and goats as offerings for their sins, and the mitred priests sprinkled the hot blood of the sacrificed victims upon mercy seat and altar. As they all went out from this stately and solemn service, to overreach and cheat each other in trade, to oppress by their exactions and cruelties the poor, to join field to field, thus building up monopolies which widened the gulf which separates the classes in the community, there was always a prophet of God at hand who with a fearlessness begotten of Heaven's indignation rebuked king and priest, judge and people. "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom. Give ear unto the law of our God,



ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?" saith the Lord; "I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When you spread forth your hands, I will hide my eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood. Cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow. I desire mercy and not sacrifice." When did the poetic genius or the colossal intellect of Greece or Rome ever rise into such spiritual insight, into such moral purity, into such intrepidity of soul as this? When did Euripides ever so prophesy, or Socrates ever so rebuke, or Seneca so preach righteousness?

The Hebrew people was filled with a race bigotry beyond any other people that can be named. They were the "first born of God"; "the people of the Covenant"; "a holy nation and a kingdom of priests." The word "Gentile," which at first they applied to themselves as well as to others, before long came to be used by them to designate all other peoples as idolatrous, uncircumcised, profane, and unclean. To the Jews "Gentile" had in it a far deeper scorn than the word "barbaros" had to the Greek. It found its last extreme of hatred and contempt towards Christians. The Gentiles existed, so the Jew thought, only for the purpose of punishing the apostasy of Judea, or of suffering the vengeance of the people of God for their hostility against them. But these prophets, nurtured under these same narrowing influences, educated by religious institutions and a creed which among the vast majority of their countrymen made them to regard all the outside world as beyond all hope or thought of God's saving care; these prophets, wonderful to tell, took all nations into their hope, embraced all people in the promises of God, and were constantly predicting the coming of a kingdom of which every inhabitant of the earth would be an obedient, rejoicing subject. The fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, from which prolific truths all our modern notions of the dignity of man, his civil rights, and the possibilities of his redemption have arisen, truths which are always giving juster forms to human governments, infusing into customs a broader charity, lifting the Church of God into greater hopes and sacrifices of missionary enterprise; these are among the mighty truths which these prophets of God beheld as from some mountain summit, and to which they steadily pointed the dull, heavy vision of successive generations.

These men, the more we study them in their lives, characters, and utterances, and the more we view these in their relations to the circumstances and influences which surrounded them, the customs and beliefs of the people of which they were a part, will fill us with mingled admiration and wonder. They must, to every thoughtful soul, form the very foundation upon which the vast superstructure of our supernatural religion rests.

But it is at this point that I would raise the question as to whether there is not a very vital and divinely purposed relation between these ancient prophets and the preachers of Christianity? Did the prophet of God as represented in the last of the Old Testament order, Malachi, or as he flashed out in the fullness of the ancient majesty and terribleness as seen in the Baptist, — did he cease from the earth, his mission forever done, living no more save in the memory of his sublime utterances, his wondrous predictions, and the unexampled greatness of his character? Or was there that in the very nature of this prophetic office, in its individual spirit and scope of teaching, and in the relations of these to the changeless conditions of human nature and society, which makes the prophet to be still a divine order in the Christian Church, and to reproduce his grandest qualities in the functions of the Christian preacher?

Without a doubt for a long time Christian thought, and even scholarship, so viewed this Old Testament order of men that it was impossible to think of them only as absolutely extinct, as belonging to a dispensation so entirely different from our own that there is no room nor necessity for their reappearance now. To ordinary thought the word "prophet" means only a predictor. The wonderful gift which God conferred upon some of these men, by which they saw and foretold with such surprising accuracy and precision of detail events and persons coming centuries after them; this wonderful, this divine gift which has astonished and baffled skepticism, has filled all men's thoughts and words about these prophets. And the word itself, "prophet," this preposition "pro," which may be interpreted *before* or *beforehand*, has very naturally been made to refer to time, and so has wrought in men the idea that the prophet was simply a foreteller. But the word itself gives no warrant for such a restrictive meaning. As Dr. Vincent has shown in his scholarly work, "Word Studies in the New Testament," the central idea of the word (prophet) is one to whom God reveals himself and through whom He speaks. The revelation may or may not relate to the future. The prophet

is a *forth-teller*, not necessarily a *foreteller*. The prophet was the interpreter of the Divine Will. The early English scholars kept to this Biblical use of the word. Prophecy to them was synonymous with preaching.

There can be no doubt that the great service to which the predictive element in prophecy has been put in Christian apologetics during the past two centuries has largely obscured the broader and more fundamental idea which really more fully possesses it, as a revelation of the Divine Will. So it is that the law of continuity which makes the two dispensations of God one is broken asunder. So it is that the grandest office under the old religion is so severed from the grandest office under the new, that the last has suffered immeasurably in our appreciation of the largeness of its spirit, and in the full exercise and best results of its ordained functions. The truth is that the real essence of the prophetic office and character belongs to and must be exhibited by the Christian preacher. Its distinctive power must be in him before he can reach the full measure of his success and serve God and humanity most effectually.

First of all, the preacher must have the prophet's profound consciousness that God is with him. The prophet was a prophet of Jehovah. What he said was the outpouring of God from within his soul. He might at times flee from this conscious presence of God; he might protest against the divine power that possessed him, and impelled him to perform its work or utter its message, but he could not escape the awful burden put upon him. Sooner or later he must speak.

Whatever views we entertain of the Christian ministry, of its honorable character, of its supreme usefulness; whatever interpretation we may put on that worn-out phrase "a call to the ministry," there can be no question that every man in it, and any man who would enter it, ought to have the prophet's sense of God down under every thought of it, behind all his work in it. So much has been said about Christian service as obligatory on all disciples; so much has been said about consecration in every profession and occupation in which one finds himself; so much is being said about the study of one's fitness for this and that work, under the constitution of one's nature, and the providential circumstances in which one is placed, that we are fast losing from this holy office of the Christian ministry its peculiar sacredness, its vast obligations, its special power and meaning. To be a minister of God, to prophesy to men in his

name in this distinctive office of the Christian preacher, is something apart from all other works and missions to which God may call men. It is the holiest of all services. It is the greatest of all. It has more of God's presence and spirit in it than all others; and he who seeks it, or is already in it, must so feel, else he has never been called by the voice of God to its peculiar duties and prerogatives.

When the transit of God's spirit came upon the prophet's soul, he was filled with a kind of bodily excitement. He was in agony. As he expressed it, he was "full of the fury of the Lord." But was it otherwise with the first Christian preacher who cried out as under the sway of an irresistible impulse, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel"? Was it anything less than this sense of God within their souls, urging them with a very omnipotence of movement, that led Peter and the others to exclaim, "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard"?

And this sense of the prophet's God in his mission is needed to give to the Christian minister the prophet's grand independence of spirit. There never was a class of men so absolutely fearless as these prophets. Timid they might be by nature, diffident in the last extreme, abhorrent of strife, loving peace, tender and sympathetic in every sensibility of their nature; but feeling that they spoke for God, they went into the presence of kings, and with unabashed faces uttered their awful rebukes and warnings. They denounced judge, priest, and people with a woe of utterance such as smote through the most brazen wickedness of their times. But was it less with John before the adulterous king? Was it less with Christ before the hypocritical priests? Was it less with Paul before the licentious Felix? Was it less with Savonarola when he poured the volumes of his volcanic fury against the popular sins of Florence? Was it less with John Knox when he stood before the queenly presence and dazzling beauty of Mary and lifted her shames straight up before her very eyes? Was it less with Bishop Ken when at the death-bed of Charles the Second he named over one by one his flagrant sins, and called him to heart-breaking repentance ere his soul sped upward to God? Was it less with the very few among the silent many who in the long years of the nation's shame anathematized slavery as "the sum of all villainies"?

The divine prophetic spirit is always one in every dispensation of God, in every condition of human affairs. It moves above the passions, prejudices, and distractions of common life and the op-

position of friends and foes, hearing ever the voice of the Eternal One saying: "Be not afraid of them; be not afraid of their faces; be not afraid of their words. Speak my words unto them, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear." "I have made thy face strong against their faces and thy forehead strong against their foreheads; as an adamant harder than flint I have made thy forehead; fear them not, neither be dismayed." It is this courage, and tenderness too; it is this authority, and also this gentleness; it is this severity, and with it this sympathy, not as proceeding from a mortal source, but the echo of the preacher's soul, that the Church is waiting for, that the world must have.

If human history has taught anything, it has taught that whenever a man has risen who has absolutely subordinated himself and his message to Him from whom it comes, the consciousness of his hearers so coalesces with his own consciousness of the same, that his "Thus saith the Lord" commands their assent, even if it does not control their conduct; so responsive is the human nature in its profoundest depths to Him who made it in likeness to his own nature. So the Apostle recognized this great truth in his description of the effect of Christian prophesying, when the preacher with the true prophetic spirit within him lays bare to another his inmost self, his very sins; "thus," says the Apostle, "the secrets of his heart are made manifest, and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth." When such a man comes into any age, it is the sign of the times that of a truth a prophet has arisen.

And when we turn to consider the character and range of those truths which burdened the prophet's teachings, his denunciations, promises, and hopes, we shall find much that will broaden the preacher's spirit and mission. These prophets proclaimed the unity and spirituality of God (as we have seen) against those tendencies which are as strong among us as it was in their times to degrade religion into a mere performance, forgetting in it all high sense of God, and all obligations to men. Well will it be for the Christian preacher now if he shall, with the same steadiness of rebuke and warning, teach the people how to worship and serve God in spirit and in truth.

But perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of these prophets was their tremendous grasp upon all terrestrial things and times. It may be, as has been affirmed, that these men had very little, if any, clear conception of an existence beyond this life, of another world where God's economy is to realize and jus-

tify itself in the perfections of heaven. However this may be, there is no mistaking one thing, that these prophets believed with all their souls that here on this *earth*, here within the space of what we mortals call "time," the mighty warfare with sin was to be carried on; that sin, wherever found, was to be fought down, and that the victory of righteousness would at last come to every people and land. And so they addressed themselves with their superb courage and hopefulness and inextinguishable hostility to every wrong; to building up righteousness not only in individuals but in society; not only in the community but throughout the nation; not only in their own nation but among all the nations of the earth.

Truth, righteousness, holiness, purity, are universal. They belong to man in every phase of his nature, and in every part of his conduct. Sin wherever found, whether in the adultery of an individual, or in the licentiousness of a people, or in the tyranny of a king, or in the cruelty of a nation; whether in a personal life, or a household habit, or a social custom, or a party's action, or a national law, was sought out by these prophets, and held up for public scorn and God's wrath. They were preachers, but no such preachers as our thoughts of the word suggest. They were not preachers at stated times and places, and upon themes that we have come to regard as religious. They preached to all life and for all life, for religion covered all life; not a religion of form, not a religion of definitions, but a religion of repentance of sin and of righteous living, applicable to every department of conduct in the man as a worshiper of God and as a citizen in the State. Hence so much in their writings which Coleridge affirmed would make "the Statesman's best Manual." Hence it was that Milton, the greatest Christian statesman of his age, wrote in loftiest praise of these Jewish prophets: —

"As men divinely taught and better teaching  
The solid rules of civil government  
In their majestic, unaffected style,  
Than all the oratory of Greece and Rome.  
In them is plainest taught and easiest learnt  
What makes a nation happy and keeps it so;  
What ruins kingdoms and lays cities flat."

History furnishes us no parallel to the influence which these men wielded. They were the leaders and formers of public opinion. "They believed in a public conscience, a public duty, a public religion, and they never failed to insist on the obligations



which give society all its force and vigor." They interpreted the politics of the age according to the universal law of God. They enunciated principles of perfect political morality which are of universal significance. If they knew anything of a hereafter, they could not see that truth then would be otherwise than truth now. If they knew anything of heaven they never dreamed that the celestial righteousness was different from the terrestrial. God is everywhere, and holiness in its simplicity and spirituality is the light of his presence.

Does all this narrow and shrivel as we come into the New Testament? Without doubt, in the clearer light which is given to the fact of individual immortality, and to the realities so awful and majestic of another life, the experiences of this present existence and the history of this world are made to seem almost as nothing. And this is especially so when viewed by men who by force of the terrible persecutions which they suffered from the world were ready to interpret the words of the Apostles into assurances that very speedily the world would be devoured by its own wickedness, and the banner of God's victory would be transferred to the heavenly plains. But at the very beginning of this new dispensation did not the angels sing "Glory in the Highest, and on *earth* peace, good will toward men." The angel's song above the plains of Bethlehem was the echo of the prophet's prediction of an age when "from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same" one anthem of worship shall ascend from earth to heaven. The prayer of our Lord which the church is ever saying: "Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on *Earth* as in Heaven," is the instrument which lifts the hinges of empires for the accomplishing of the prophet's vision when "the saints of the Most High shall take the *Kingdom* and possess the *Kingdom* forever, even forever and ever." Very clearly this plane of earth, which is the field upon which the forces of good and evil so fiercely contend, is to be the scene of an infinite triumph before which every curse will flee away.

But how is the victory to be won? Is this gospel which we preach any less forceful, any less sweeping than the message which the prophet uttered? Is "Christ and Him crucified" a gospel only to the individual soul? Does it not carry with it an arraignment of society for its unblushing sins, for its gross materialism, its shameful dissipations; of the nation for its rank political corruptions, its low, defiling partisanship, its racial bigotry? Are not the leaves of the tree upon which the Son of God was hung, for

the healing of nations? Is not the turbid stream of public life to be sweetened by "the branch of righteousness"?

The meaning of Christ's advent is the beginning of a kingdom, not only in the heart of him who accepts Him as a personal Saviour, but a kingdom it is to communities of men, to humanity fighting blindly and destructively with forces in society and government which oppress and misuse it. How far short does the Christian preacher's vision go of this world-wide outlook when he limits his work and hope to the salvation of the individuals whose names are added to the list of church members! It has been finely said: "Christianity is essentially a political principle and a political power." It being so, its call is to national repentance, to social reformation as well as personal conversion. One of the most open-eyed readers of God's Word and of God's providence, Maurice, said: "We must speak again the ancient language, that God has made a covenant with the nation, if we would have an inward repentance which will really bring us back to God, . . . which will go down to the roots of our lives, . . . which will bear fruit upward, giving nobleness to our policy and literature and art, to the daily routine of what we shall no more dare to call our secular existence." "The ancient language," so stern in its rebuke of the popular will, so stern in its defiance of regal tyranny, so stern in its denunciation of sacerdotal corruption, and yet so tremulous with sympathy, with human sorrow, so pulsating with love for human souls, and so hopeful of the power of Christianity to right every wrong and redeem every man, and save the world, — who can speak this "ancient language"? Can the politician of the day whose highest ideal of politics is that it is a vast, intricate machine where all interests which can affect society, all influences which sway classes, all motives which can move the individual, are to be so worked that our party shall succeed, that our man shall be elected? Can the statesman whose gravest thought and most serious counsel are to so divide the rich spoils of victory that each state and territory and faction of the triumphant party shall receive its official meat in due season? Where among them all do we hear one voice speaking above the sullen roar of the hungry herd a single truth which is awaking the nation to the grandeur of its divine promise in contrast with this burning shame? Is not the declaration of the Kansas senator, that "The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount have nothing to do with politics," the working creed of "our great leaders"? Can the newspaper press, so omnipresent, reaching by its almost hourly

issue every household of the land ; can it speak, will it speak, those truths which touch the consciences of men, which call them away from the low blinding prejudices of partisanship to an eager, earnest contention for that which shall make the nation to be purer and grander not only in material strength, but in moral character ; a blessing to itself and to all the nations of the earth ? From none of these quarters, representing so much of the power and influence of our times, do we catch those tones which with such moral emphasis and highest patriotic appeal and solemn reference to the Eternal's judgment once rebuked alike the tyranny of kings and the frenzy of the people.

The gospel, Christ told us, was to remedy every wrong. How to-day is it dealing with the awful problems of life ? To what extent is it fronting the huge greed of the times, which builds its fortunes and riots in its pleasures on the misery and ruin of the many ? Surely there are ulcers which our boasted Christian civilization itself creates ; there are vices, degradations, supreme woes, which spring up with peculiar fecundity out of what we so complacently call "Christian soil." It is social crime ; it is civic corruption ; it is nationalized wickedness, — it is these in their awful concreteness as they propagate themselves in the great centres of population which stand in battle array before the Church of God. Plainly it is God's call to his preachers to speak his message of denunciation and warning against such public iniquities. With even that same intense pungency of indignation with which the Master denounced the hard hypocrisy of his age must his commissioned followers denounce the shames and crimes which give a character to our time and people.

The martial metaphor of the greatest soldier of the Cross seems fittest to set forth the terrific conflict of this age : "The adversaries with whom we wrestle," says Paul, "are not flesh and blood, but they are Principalities, the Powers, and the Sovereigns of the darkness of this present generation, the spiritual forces of wickedness in high places."

*George B. Spalding.*

SYRACUSE, NEW YORK.

## EDITORIAL.

## CARDINAL NEWMAN.

THE recent death of Cardinal Newman has removed a striking figure from English life. Scarcely a man in it not in politics had impressed his personality more deeply upon the mind of his countrymen. The place Tennyson holds among English poets of the century, and Gladstone among English statesmen, that, at any rate as respects fame, Newman held among English theologians.

This was partly due, no doubt, to his conversion to Rome. Had he remained in the English Church, even though he had reached its highest place, he would have had a smaller share of public attention than that which fell to him. But his remarkable powers and influence made his conversion the striking fact it was. In the case of a smaller man the unpopularity of the act would have soon caused its author to be forgotten. Men do not usually remember a person whom they wish to forget. But Newman had too much power before his conversion, and showed too much ability after it, to pass out of mind. His fame, though it waned for years after he went to Rome, grew bright again, and steadily gained lustre to the end.

It is not our purpose to describe the career so luminously sketched in the "Apologia," and lately recounted by the journals. Assuming that our readers are not ignorant of facts so generally known, we wish to point out some of Newman's characteristics as a writer, and to give some thoughts suggested by his conversion to Rome.

Let it however be said, in passing, that the Cardinal's early life should be studied in the light thrown on it by his brother-in-law, T. B. Mozley's "Reminiscences of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement," and J. A. Froude's sketch entitled "J. H. Newman" in the fourth series of his "Short Studies on Great Subjects," in order to appreciate the man. He evidently had an extremely strong and engaging personality. Froude says: "A man of genius . . . is a spring in which there is always more behind than flows from it. The painting or the poem is but a part of him inadequately realized, and his nature expresses itself with equal or fuller completeness in his life, his conversation, and personal presence. This was eminently true of Newman. Greatly as his poetry had struck me, he was himself all that the poetry was, and something far beyond. I had then never seen so impressive a person." Again he says: "I still looked on him — I do at this moment — as one of the two most remarkable men I have ever met with." And again: "Thus it was that we, who had never seen such another man, and to whom he appeared, perhaps, at special advantage in contrast with the normal college don, came to regard Newman with the affection of pupils (though pupils, strictly speaking, he had none) for an idolized master. The simplest word

which dropped from him was treasured as if it had been an intellectual diamond. For hundreds of young men *Credo in Newmanum* was the genuine symbol of faith."

Evidently such a man as this cannot be fully found out by the mere study of his books, self-revealing as these are, one of them self-descriptive so far as the growth of religious views goes. Assuming this, we will speak of some of the leading features of his mind as shown in his writings. To begin with, it is essentially religious, as deeply so as that of any man of our time. It has been said, and with truth, that Newman was not in the main bent and the deepest inclinations of his mind a theologian. What he chiefly cared about was not abstract truth; it was the religious life; men's spiritual fellowship with God. How this was to be maintained and what it implied were the themes to which he most naturally turned. He says in the "Apologia" that he learned early in life to "rest in the thought of two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator." We believe these words to be in a deep and wide sense self-revealing; we find in them the main bent of Newman's mind as well as the determining principle of his character. The intense desire to realize, to describe, to justify the life in God we hold to have been the master passion of his life. His interest in theology was swallowed up in his interest in religion. Of this another passage in the "Apologia" gives curious evidence: "From the age of fifteen dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion; I know no other religion; I cannot enter into the idea of any other sort of religion; religion as a mere sentiment is to me a mere dream and a mockery." And what does he mean by dogma? The words immediately following inform us: "As well can there be filial love without the fact of a father, as devotion without the fact of a Supreme God." Dogma, then, is the truth about God; that in which the soul recognizes the object of supreme love and devotion. This Newman would of course identify with the Catholic theology taken as a whole; but evidently its main interest to him is its subjective side, the personal apprehension of the Supreme Being which it yields. We may then agree with these words of an able critic of his writings: "For abstract truth it is clear to us that he has no engrossing affection; his strength lay in his own apprehension of it, in his power of defending it when once it had been so apprehended and had become engrafted into him; and it is to this as made one with himself, and to his own inward life as fed and nourished by it that he continually reverts."

This is the mind of a preacher, and a preacher Newman was more than anything else. The higher qualities of his mind and his literary power are most fully disclosed in his sermons. This is very significant in view of the fact that they are *bona fide* sermons, preached in the course of stated pulpit service, made primarily for hearing, not for reading. To find his peculiar gifts most fully used here is to establish our

conviction that it was the religious life which most deeply interested his mind.

That the gifts shown in these sermons are great ones need hardly be said. Every educated man knows the power which Newman wielded as a preacher in the pulpit of St. Mary's, Oxford. No English preacher of the century has, we believe, influenced educated audiences so deeply and so long. Says Froude: "No one who heard his sermons in those days can ever forget them. They were seldom directly theological. We had theology enough and to spare from the select preachers before the university. Newman, taking some Scripture character for a text, spoke to us about ourselves, our temptations, our experiences. His illustrations were inexhaustible. He seemed to be addressing the most secret consciousness of each of us — as the eyes of a portrait appear to look at every person in the room. He was never exaggerated; he was never unreal. A sermon from him was a poem, formed on a distinct idea, fascinating by its subtlety, welcome — how welcome! from its sincerity, interesting from its originality, even to those who were careless of religion; and to others who wished to be religious, but had found religion dry and wearisome, it was like the springing of a fountain out of the rock."

The sermons which made such impression when delivered live now upon the printed page among the very few effective sermons which take permanent place in literature. This is in great measure because of that gift of expression which put Cardinal Newman at the very head of English prose writers. Any one who will give good thoughts in a manner supremely graceful, easy, lucid, subtly finished, and delicately strong is sure of a hearing. This Newman has done in his sermons. But he has done more. His thoughts are not only good, they are high and deep. They present the loftiest truths of Christianity as apprehended by a mind of peculiar refinement, and imaginative force, a mind to which spiritual things were most real, and at the same time mysterious in their reality, whose vision of truth and of the mysteriousness of truth is given in the hymn, "Lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom."

We are aware that the encomiums which these sermons have won from good critics, such, for example, as Mr. Hutton of the London "Spectator" and the late Principal Shairp, seem to some undeserved. They are so simple in their structure and style, so devoid of philosophical reasoning and of illustrative ornament as to seem common-place to some discriminating readers. Doubtless they do not correspond to the ordinary conception of what a sermon should be. Probably they would not have had, if preached to a town congregation, the effect which we know attended them preached in Oxford. Be that as it may, if they are read and reread simply as literature, disregarding all opinion as to what should belong to a sermon, they will appear greater and greater, as mountains whose mass is half-concealed by the very clearness of the air about them grow greater as one gazes on them.



We pass on to Newman's abandonment of the Anglican for the Roman Catholic Church. His peculiar gifts, taken in connection with his doctrinal views, justify, it must be admitted, the discussion to which this most important act of his life gave rise. The ablest and most churchly man of the Anglican Church becomes convinced that it is in schism from the true church and leaves it. The leader of a party devoted to awakening in the Church of England the consciousness of being through its sacraments a channel of divine grace becomes convinced that the religious principles upon which he is acting demand his submission to the Pope. The fervid, yet logical Christian whose soul burns with the conviction "that dogma is the fundamental principle of religion," that "there is a visible Church, with sacraments and rites which are the channels of invisible grace, that the Anglican Bishop is in his diocese the successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ," finds that he cannot continue to be a Christian unless he enter the Roman communion.

Here is something challenging the attention of all who would know the relation of Christianity to Churchism. Admitting the genuineness of Newman's change of belief respecting the standing of the Anglican Church, how are we to account for it? Are we to regard it, with him, as the product of his earlier convictions, and to see in the Roman Catholic the ripened Anglo-Catholic, or are we to attribute the change to other causes, temperament or circumstance, or both?

We see no ground for hesitation in answering the question. The only external influences likely to impel Newman towards Rome were the charges which the bishops issued against "Tract Number Ninety," and the outcry raised against him by the Liberals. These attacks he felt deeply, no doubt, but he could not have been goaded by them into a change of belief. As Froude says: "A man of so much ability would never have rushed to conclusions so precipitately merely on account of a few bishops' charges." As for his temperament, that was not one to make him take so serious a step hastily. His powerful imagination was the servant of his reason and his moral convictions. He was, if the descriptions of him given by his friends and the impressions made by his writings can be trusted, anything but an impulsive man; calm, resolute, self-contained. Indeed, the fact that he waited for light two years after resigning his pulpit and giving up all clerical service shows that in this instance he acted from deliberate conviction.

And the sketch of his mental history during the years preceding his change of communion shows, we think, a mind calmly maturing its convictions. Doubt seized him as to whether Christianity as he understood it did not mean Roman Catholicism. He did not cherish it. "He would not make his judgment blind." It passed away. It came again an unwelcome guest. It led to questioning, to slow testing of old opinions, to self-denying action by which liberty for further questioning was gained, to long and painful search for light, finally to new conviction — the convic-

tion that those views of Christianity which had made their holder a zealous Anglo-Catholic meant that he could not be a Christian outside the Roman communion. "I am a Catholic by virtue of my believing in a God."

It must be owned, therefore, that churchly views of Christianity ripened, in one of the most logical and sincere minds of the century, into Roman Catholic belief. And to admit this is to grant the possibility, at any rate, that Newman was right, and that to find the authority and the gracious help of Christianity in the life and action of an earthly organization is (if one do not blindly or willfully abandon consistency) to bow to Rome. We do not intimate that the High Church conception of Christianity is that of the Anglo-Catholic Newman. We do not care to call in question the opinion expressed by Bishop Wilberforce in the "Quarterly Review," that Newman "appears never to have occupied a thoroughly real Church of England position. He was at first, by education and private judgment, a Calvinistic Puritan; he became dissatisfied with the coldness and barrenness of this theory, and set about finding a new position for himself, and in so doing he skipped over true sound English churchmanship into a course of feeling and thought allied with and leading on to Rome." The correctness of this statement chiefly concerns those who belong to the Anglican communion; all Christians have an interest in the proof Newman's career furnishes that the view of the church which he held and powerfully inculcated finds its only consistent expression in Roman Catholicism.

It does not lie within our purpose to discuss this view of the church in its relation to Christianity. We desire only to quote some words from one of Newman's Catholic books as illustrating its outcome:—

"In the midst of our difficulties, I have one ground of hope, just one stay, but as I think, a sufficient one, which serves one in the stead of all other argument whatever, which hardens one against criticism, which supports me if I begin to despond, and to which I ever come round when the question of the possible and the expedient is brought into discussion. It is the decision of the Holy See; St. Peter has spoken, it is he who has enjoined that which seems to us so unpromising. He has spoken and has a claim on us to trust him. He is no recluse, no solitary student, no dreamer about the past, no doter upon the dead and gone, no projector of the visionary. He for eighteen hundred years has lived in the world; he has seen all fortunes, he has encountered all adversaries, he has shaped himself for all emergencies. If ever there was a power on earth who had an eye for the times, who has confined himself to the practicable, and has been happy in his anticipations, whose words have been facts, and whose commands prophesies, such is he in the history of ages, who sits from generation to generation in the Chair of the Apostles, as the Vicar of Christ and the Doctor of his Church." A doctrine of the church which makes an able man in the nineteenth century,

reared in a great Protestant university, willing to talk like that is not likely to prevail, unless Christianity be the foe of common sense.

The deep mental craving which underlay Cardinal Newman's churchmanship and ultimately led him to Rome was the craving for religious certainty. He saw that the human soul needs to be established in absolute conviction in order rightly to live. The Christian faith is not normal unless the intellect is fully convinced. It should be strong enough to make a man willing to surrender his life for the things of which it brings information, but a man will not die for anything of whose existence he is not certain. The Christian, then, must have certainty, and where can he find it? Not in the Bible, said Newman, for he cannot be sure that he interprets the Bible aright. "Experience proves surely that the Bible does not answer a purpose for which it was never intended. It may be accidentally the means of the conversion of individuals; but a book, after all, cannot make a stand against the wild living intellect of man, and in this day it begins to testify as regards its own structure and contents, to the power of that universal solvent which is so successfully acting upon religious establishments."

Where, then, may the Christian find certainty? God, says Newman, has made provision for this want of his nature, by planting his church in the world and endowing it, when speaking by its constituted authorities and upon the themes and within the limits assigned to it, with infallibility. The Christian may listen to its assertions respecting divine things with the same confidence with which he would hear the words of Christ were the Master to appear again and teach in his presence.

We hold, of course, with all Protestants, that God has not taken this way of satisfying the soul's desire for certainty. We believe that the claim of infallibility for his Church, whether it speak through Council or Pope, is a monstrous assumption, unsupported by the words or deeds of the Founder of Christianity, and shown over and over to be false by the errors of councils and of popes. But we believe that beneath this claim lies a most important truth, namely, that the certainty which the soul craves must come from a living source. It cannot be given by the study of a book eighteen centuries old, uniquely divine though that book be. The Bible's divineness cannot be proved to those who have no faith in the truths which it conveys. Plainly, then, it cannot be, however and wherever composed, the one source of Christian certainty. Here Cardinal Newman was right. The Scriptures cannot do a work not theirs. He was wrong, and in our view it was the deep error of his thinking, in disbelieving that the source of certainty is the Spirit of God speaking in the soul and assuring it that the act of faith in which it seeks deliverance from sin reaches and finds response from a personal Redeemer. He seems to have thought too meanly of the soul to believe that it could be the organ of such a divine testimony. He appears to have believed the reason so inveterately prone to falsehood that even when the heart

had been renewed, it could not safely be employed with divine truth lest it corrupt it and make it unnutritious. So he turned for that certainty which he knew he must have to the church, and ultimately to the Pope.

We could trace, were there time, the influence of this undue depreciation of human nature upon Cardinal Newman's theology, in making it defective in its recognition of that part of Christianity which belongs to the present life, and of those aspects of the divine character which are especially winning and lovely. But we gladly pass on to a closing thought, one which we can only suggest, that it is a great lesson for English-speaking Protestants, that a man of such rare gifts and high aim and true piety should go from them under stress of strong conviction into the Roman Catholic Church, find spiritual peace there, and show there unsullied manhood and undiminished powers. What does this mean but that the life of Christ animates this great branch of his church notwithstanding its errors? And may not the error of doctrine, as we regard it, which has shown itself congenial to the defect in this great mind have as its complement some truth neglected by Protestantism especially fitted to nourish his soul? And may we not see in the career of one who has won the reverence of his countrymen by his sincere life in both communions a sign that the day is swiftly coming when there shall be one flock as there is one Shepherd?

#### THE PRESENT TENDENCY IN THEOLOGY.

WHAT is the future of theology? What is its coming task in the progress of Christianity? Is its function henceforth to be as important as in former times? Is its place to be held by real influence or by tradition only? And if by influence, in what respects and for what reasons? Questions like these are often asked by some who believe that theology is a waning science, painfully struggling to hold its place, but certain to lose it, and by others who know that a science which has to do with the *rationale* of religion can never be without importance, but who do not see clearly the direction it is taking nor the supreme service it is destined to render. The former class of questioners underrate the present and future work of theology, partly from a mistaken notion of its functions, and partly because nearly all theologians and systems of the past have been encumbered with a mass of material foreign to the province and task of theology. The latter class of questioners are not in doubt concerning the prominent place theology must ever hold, but are trying to foresee the changes it will undergo and the principles which will control its further development. We shall not attempt to give a complete answer to these questions, but shall only offer a few observations which may serve to indicate in a general way the coming work of theology and also to suggest the importance of the task which it now has before it.

Concisely, theology is taking shape more and more in relation to the *ends* of Christianity in the character of man and the kingdom of God. In technical phrase, theology is becoming prevailingly teleological. The final cause of religion, the result it seeks in the person and in society, is to be the decisive consideration in respect to every doctrine of religion and in respect to the rational and spiritual grounds on which all doctrines are found to rest. To say this is to say that theology has to do with the motive power of religion, and that it is therefore concerned and is to be increasingly occupied with the reconstruction of doctrine from the side of motive. What is going forward is not the decay of theology, but the restoration or recovery of theology to the uses of religion. This implies a constructive in place of a defensive development of doctrine. It will always be the duty of the theologian to defend beliefs against attack and objection, to show that the traditional opinions may reasonably be held, to explain how this and that can at the same time be true; but his greater service will be to bring out in complete proportions the truth of religion as motive power in the perfection of character and the realization of the kingdom of God.

Recently, after the examination of a young man for the Presbyterian ministry, a listener remarked that the candidate seemed to know something about Arminianism and Sabellianism and predestination and decrees and substitutionary atonement, but very little about the simple truths of the gospel as adapted to the actual needs of modern life. If it was the fault of the youth rather than of his interrogators that he represented Christianity in so distorted a perspective, the impression made on the listener would signify, not that theology is a worthless study or a mere thing of the past, but that theology should interpret truth in full view of its outcome in life, and should be passing from the relatively easier task of defining the possible modes in which God's revelation in Christ may appear consistent, to the more important and therefore difficult task of translating the fact and truth of religion as motive into the actual and ideal life of humanity. If theology is a doubtful psychology, a mistaken anthropology, and a crude theodicy of arbitrary decree, and can be nothing but a readjustment of such notions to meet objections, it has no future; but if it is the recognition, interpretation, and symmetrical unfolding of those facts and beliefs which appeal to what is highest in man and promise what is the best for the world, it may still claim, with some pride of preëminence, to be the queen of all sciences and philosophies, and with a loving devotion to be the most cherished handmaiden of religion.

For example, the doctrine of the person of Christ may be thought by some to be held more loosely and vaguely than in former times. Instead of the exact distinctions of nature and person, the careful separation of divine and human, the precise function of the Second Person of the Trinity, the identity of the Logos with the Son of Man, there seems to be a very indefinite thought of the nature of Christ, a very qualified belief

in his actual Deity, a disposition to be satisfied with the opinion that in some way He was divinely taught and that He revealed God's love to men. And yet the change is from abstractions to realities. The endeavor is made to know Him as the source of spiritual power, to learn what divineness is as it is embodied in a perfect human character and a sympathizing human heart. The distrust of exact psychological and philosophical theories comes not from a reduced estimation but from an enlarging view of the personality they have attempted to measure. Some of the larger as well as nearer relationships of divine and human have been coming into view. God and his world have been comprehended in their intimacy of life because He is felt as immanent presence and palpitating power in the universe. God and humanity have been found in mutual affinity, and no longer separated by the immeasurable distance interposed by former thought between absolute and finite being. And out of such deeper knowledge come illumination and insight concerning the Person who has brought God nearest to the thought and life of his children. So of the doctrine of atonement through the sufferings of Christ. It is to be understood in the light of the restoration of man to sonship with God, and of the renewed and perfected society which is to constitute the kingdom of God in purified law and custom and life. The decisive question about the sacrifice of Christ is with regard to the objects it was intended to accomplish in human life. Theology, therefore, will not lay so strong emphasis as formerly on the removal of penalty, nor lay stress chiefly on the equivalence of Christ's suffering with the punishment of sin, but will go more directly to the new life of man in harmony with God and to its promise of perfection. It is not necessary to multiply illustrations to show that theology has its task in showing, not the mere credibility, but the deepest significance of Christianity for the life of man. The inquiry in every instance is in relation to the power of the truth. In its power is found its wisdom. Christ is the wisdom of God to intellectual inquiry largely because He is the power of God to the heart.

When the truth is thus united with the power of doctrine it may seem as if nothing had occurred but a return to primitive Christianity, as if there had been long periods of unfruitful speculation, after which weary and disappointed thought is returning to the simple facts of the gospel as they were originally received. May there not have been, however, the process through which reflective thought always advances? A given magnitude of fact or truth is first recognized and makes the natural impression of its wholeness. Afterwards it is analyzed into its elements and relations, but finally is known again in its totality, yet with more intelligence and appreciation. Thus philosophy says to-day that man is not a bundle of faculties which act independently. It is not true that his intellect perceives, his emotions feel, and his will chooses. The whole man is active in every thought, feeling, and choice. These are



merely modes of his activity which disclose the variety of the powers of the one undivided personality. But this knowledge is not a return to the period of simplicity when man lived unreflectingly in the world, a child unconscious of his powers and prompted by impulse. The knowledge of himself and of his own faculties, a knowledge combined into the unity of philosophy, has accompanied and largely produced his upward progress in the subjugation of nature and in the advances of culture and history. In his later life a Christian scholar said that he held to only a few simple beliefs, that he did not attach importance to many doctrines he once accepted. But his later faith was more than the unquestioning trust of childhood. Years of reflection and experience had sifted beliefs, and he had learned the value of those truths which control life and shape character. What he accepted in childhood on authority had become the intelligent faith of his maturity by a process of separating the real from the nonessential. Thus the church at the outset accepted the facts of Christianity as the spiritual forces of life. Then followed periods of doctrinal development, which were really periods of analysis, when systems of beliefs were elaborately drawn out; but now the truth is seen again in its spiritual magnitude as a complete whole of essential principles emancipated from many of the artificialities and refinements which had encumbered it. But thought has not, therefore, merely moved in a circle and returned to its starting-point unchanged. The doctrinal ideas of the early church needed the enlargement of later reflective thought to be adapted to the personal and social needs of modern life. The elements which were contained in the original gospel required that development through centuries of thought by which they should become the moving forces of society.

At all events, the effort of theology now is to find what there is in every fact and doctrine of Christianity for the religious life of the individual and for the progress of society. A purely speculative interest no longer exists, but the practical aim of religious truth is the controlling consideration.

Therefore it is a step in advance which is about to be taken from the thought of Christianity as a revelation to the thought of it as a redemption. The principal inquiry of the last century was concerning a revelation. Its possibility, necessity, and reasonableness were discussed. Miracles were defended as the proofs of revelation. The knowledge of God was divided into provinces as it was believed to be derived from nature or reason or revelation. The ordinary disclosures of God in Providence and history were distinguished from the extraordinary disclosures of revelation. Theology was on the defensive. It labored to prove that so-called natural agencies could not account for miracles and the person and resurrection of Christ. It constructed exact theories of the inspiration of the writers of the Bible, until even the revelation itself was subordinate to the inspiration which was thought to guarantee its

accuracy. It is, indeed, a gain that the revelation is now considered more important than the mode in which men received and communicated it; but a still larger gain is found in the advance from revelation to redemption, from a body of truth which is not incredible to a body of truth which is the renewing and perfecting power of life. Redemption is the final cause of revelation, and all truth which restores man to his ideal, and transmutes society into the kingdom of God, is a revelation. The interest and value of it are in such relation. And the best evidence that God reveals himself in Christianity is found in the results of the gospel in the world. To put it in a word, theology has, on the whole, in the past, attempted chiefly to establish belief, so that reasons enough shall appear to keep people from relinquishing their faith in Christianity and the Bible; but theology now is attempting to discover the relations of Christianity to life, so that its power shall proceed unhindered to its intended results. Under the old method, its object was to keep men from losing their faith. Under the new method, its object is to give faith its redeeming power in life. At no time have the doctrines of the gospel been totally separated from redemption. But as to emphasis, the change is going on from a speculative and defensive support of those truths which in any view are inseparable from redemption to a constructive and spiritual development of doctrine in its bearing upon the redemption of the individual to his uses and of society to its ideal as the kingdom of God.

It follows from the present tendency of doctrinal development that less interest is likely to be taken in ascertaining the central principle of theology. The phrase "Christo-centric" has had a recent use in recognizing the actual revelation of God in Christ as more important than the decree of God as the expression of his eternal purpose. By comparison it was a step in advance to perceive that not the sovereignty of God but his revelation in Christ is central in theology. But it would be quite as correct to take the result as central rather than the original purpose or the means of redemption, and so to say that the gospel is anthropo-centric. In fact, it is no contradiction to hold that it is Deo-centric and Christo-centric and anthropo-centric. God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself is the whole gospel, and one of the elements may not be separated out as central, that is, most important and all controlling. So it might be said, and with perfect truth, that gravitation is the central law of the universe, or evolution, or force, or rational life, as the thought is of cause, mode, or end. Yet from the temporary magnifying of each truth in theology permanent gain has been secured. The sovereignty of God is not arbitrary, and it does not reduce men to insignificance; but it is the resting-place of thought as well as of trust by its truth of divine power in the service of divine wisdom. The person and sacrifice of Christ are not to be viewed chiefly as satisfactory to some unintelligible demand of God's justice, nor the glory of the Son in the universe as

God's end in creation, but Christ is the object of trust to penitent souls and the source of life to the world. And now that the renewed and perfected life of man in society, that is, the kingdom of God as the end of revelation, is recognized as the test and measure of all doctrine, we are retaining what is essential in former belief, and at the same time enlarging our view to take in the complete horizon of truth.

Dorner's definition of theology is therefore incomplete. He says it is the exhibition of Christianity *as truth*. But this may be purely intellectual. The task of theology is not completed when Christianity is accepted as reasonable. The complete function of theology is the exhibition of Christianity *as truth for life*.

It is a significant indication of the recovery of theology to its proper uses that its work is enlarging to include Christian ethics. It sees that ethics is the complement of doctrine. And it broadens the field of ethics to include the individual, realizing his personal ideal, and also the progress and history of the world as portraying the development of man's collective life advancing towards its social ideal.

In the considerations which have been suggested, the importance of theology becomes apparent. Moral progress must be self-directed, if not in its lower, certainly in its higher stages. There must be knowledge of the ends which are worthy to be pursued and of the methods by which those ends are to be realized. As a true scholar must set his own tasks and have in view the large outcome of a lifetime's intellectual industry, so a child of God, after the period of nonage, must see the ideal of character and see the spiritual laws, the motive powers in the moral world which are at his service for making the ideal real. He must have a knowledge of God, of the world, of himself, of society, and of God's plan for the individual and for mankind. That is to say, he must have a theology. All influential religious thinkers are theologians, although some would reject the title. The effective preacher is a theologian as he brings into view the character of God, his purposes for the person and for humanity, and as he interprets the motive powers by which men shall seek that which is highest. As every statesman and every intelligent citizen tries to understand correctly the theory of government, the ends of national life, and the measures appropriate to such ends, so the theologian and the preacher and the intelligent Christian try to understand, and need to understand, the objects, laws, and methods of God's kingdom of righteousness.

The illusion lingers that periods of reflection, when men begin to philosophize, are inferior to periods of spontaneous, impulsive, natural life, and that likewise when reflection on religion begins to construct theology the vigor of primitive piety is weakened. The childhood of persons and of peoples has, indeed, a charm all its own; but undirected impulse and unintelligent trust are not manhood. Progress puts away childish things and travels onwards in ever-increasing intellectual and spiritual strength.

## PROFESSOR HUXLEY, CANON LIDDON, AND "LUX MUNDI."

THERE could not well be any stronger evidence of the perennial interest of theology, than the attraction which its problems have for minds of the most widely different type and the most untheological prepossessions. Mr. Matthew Arnold is an example which will occur to every one. He was a poet of rare quality, if not of the widest range or the most popular song; a critic who was always bent on discovering the reason for the judgments of taste, and teaching us not only what to admire, but why. In this world of rampant Philistinism, that was surely a mission high enough, hard enough. But his genius bade him annex theology to literature. Interesting as his theological writings are, and valuable as the expression of that literary point of view which the exact scholar is so prone to miss; true as much that he said is, and well said as it all is, when we look at the slender volume of his verse we cannot but regret that, less wise than the vine in Jotham's fable, he let himself be tempted away from his "wine that rejoiceth Gods and men" by the deceitful promise of authority in the forest. Mr. Huxley is another conspicuous illustration of the enchantment of theology. He preaches interesting and instructive "Lay-sermons;" but it is as a controversial theologian that he has won his chief fame. He is, like all born controversialists, a bit of an Ishmaelite, withal, and shows no favor to any party, sect, or school. His point of view is that of a man of science who has engaged himself primarily with the problems of life; and of the godfather, if not the father, of agnosticism, a philosophy which is, he contends, the necessary correlate of experimental science. He thinks clearly, has a straightforward way of going to the heart of the matter, and a trenchant style which make him no mean antagonist. More than that, he writes with the earnestness of a man to whom truth is dear. His controversy with Professor Wace is fresh in memory. In a recent number of the "Nineteenth Century"<sup>1</sup> he has taken his position in the discussion which has sprung up in England over the volume of essays entitled "Lux Mundi," especially over the chapter on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration." In this article Mr. Huxley ranges himself squarely by the side of Canon Liddon in the position that proof of the unhistorical character of the Old Testament narratives, especially of those which are assumed in the New Testament to be true, would be fatal to Christianity. After stating this position as held by an earlier apologist, he writes:—

"My utmost ingenuity does not enable me to discover a flaw in the argument thus briefly summarized. I am fairly at a loss to comprehend how any one, for a moment, can doubt that Christian theology must stand or fall with the historical trustworthiness of the Jewish Scriptures. The very conception of the Messiah, or Christ, is inextricably interwoven with Jewish history; the identification of Jesus of Nazareth with that Messiah rests upon the interpretation of passages of the Hebrew Scriptures which have no evidential value

<sup>1</sup> July, 1890.

unless they possess the historical character assigned to them. If the covenant with Abraham was not made ; if circumcision and sacrifices were not ordained by Jahveh ; if the 'ten words' were not written by God's hand on the stone tables ; if Abraham is more or less a mythical hero, such as Theseus ; the story of the Deluge a fiction ; that of the Fall a legend ; and that of the Creation the dream of a seer ; if all these definite and detailed narratives of apparently real events have no more value as history than have the stories of the regal period of Rome — what is to be said about the Messianic doctrine, which is so much less clearly enunciated ? And what about the authority of the writers of the books of the New Testament, who, on this theory, have not merely accepted flimsy fictions for solid truths, but have built the very foundations of Christian dogma upon legendary quicksands ? ”

He quotes from Canon Liddon's sermon the strong passage in which the preacher declares that, —

“For Christians it is enough to know that our Lord Jesus Christ set the seal of his infallible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament. He found the Hebrew Canon as we have it in our hands to-day, and he treated it as an authority which was above discussion. Nay more : He went out of his way — if we may reverently speak thus — to sanction not a few portions of it which modern skepticism rejects. When He would warn his hearers against the dangers of spiritual relapse, He bids them remember ‘Lot's wife.’ When He would point out how worldly engagements may blind the soul to a coming judgment, He reminds them how men ate, and drank, and married, and were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the Flood came and destroyed them all. If He would put his finger on a fact in past Jewish history which, by its admitted reality, would warrant belief in his own coming resurrection, He points to Jonah's being three days and three nights in the whale's belly.”

And he agrees with Canon Liddon that neither the theory of accommodation, nor the alternative, that Jesus shared in these points the popular ignorance, is admissible, quoting his words again : —

“They will find it difficult to persuade mankind that, if He could be mistaken on a matter of such strictly religious importance as the value of the sacred literature of his countrymen, He can safely be trusted about anything else. The trustworthiness of the Old Testament is, in fact, inseparable from the trustworthiness of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and if we believe that He is the true Light of the world, we shall close our ears against suggestions impairing the credit of those Jewish Scriptures which have received the stamp of his divine authority.”

Is Saul also among the prophets ? Mr. Huxley among the conservatives is certainly an edifying sight. We do not remember to have seen it more broadly or more positively put anywhere, that if the story of Jonah, or Lot's wife, or the account of the Flood, is not true, the authority of Christ, who uses them in argument or illustration as true, is necessarily destroyed.

But while Canon Liddon and those of his way of thinking generally treat this conclusion as a *reductio ad absurdum* by which the truth of

the Old Testament is indirectly demonstrated, Mr. Huxley sets to work to prove that the story of the Flood is unhistorical. The rationalistic theory of a partial Deluge finds no more favor at his hands than the universal Deluge of the old-fashioned faith.

"In view, not of the recondite speculations of infidel philosophers, but of the plainest and most commonplace of ascertained physical facts, the story of the Noachian Deluge has no more claim to credit than has that of Deucalion; and whether it was, or was not, suggested by the familiar acquaintance of its originators with the effects of unusually great overflows of the Tigris and Euphrates, it is utterly devoid of historical truth."

Historical criticism, he adds, which recognizes the composite character of the narrative, and its internal contradictions, and shows its probable dependence on Babylonian myth, tends to exactly the same conclusion. In this state of affairs, he says:—

"I can but admire the courage and clear foresight of the Anglican divine who tells us that we must be prepared to choose between the trustworthiness of scientific method and the trustworthiness of that which the church declares to be divine authority. For, to my mind, this declaration of war to the knife against secular science, even in its most elementary forms; this rejection without a moment's hesitation of any and all evidence which conflicts with theological dogma, is the only position which is logically reconcilable with the axioms of orthodoxy. If the Gospels truly report that which an incarnation of the God of Truth communicated to the world, then it surely is absurd to attend to any other evidence touching matters about which He made any clear statement, or the truth of which is distinctly implied by his words. If the exact historical truth of the Gospels is an axiom of Christianity, it is as just and right for a Christian to say, Let us close our ears against the suggestions of scientific critics, as it is for the man of science to refuse to waste his time upon circle-squarers and flat-earth fanatics."

This is the dilemma to which Canon Liddon and Professor Huxley agree that Christianity is reduced. It is worth something to have the consequences of this "easy way" with Old Testament critics remorselessly thought through and unflinchingly declared; and we share Mr. Huxley's admiration for Canon Liddon's logic, and for his courage. But we think it probable that many men will find the conclusion very like a *reductio ad absurdum*, and say to themselves that there must be some flaw in the premises, however self-evident they may seem, which land us in such a dilemma.

Mr. Huxley has not so good an opinion of the newer apologetic, represented for him by the authors of "*Lux Mundi*," which undertakes to reconcile orthodoxy with natural science and historical criticism by compromises. Those who think such a reconciliation possible do not, he would say, see clear or think straight. In the somewhat discouraging outlook into the future which he allows himself at the end of the article, he thinks that these compromises are likely to prevail for a time, — it is a day of compromises, — and to conceal the truth from the mass of men. But general acceptance will make them neither better nor truer.



We are quite at one with Professor Huxley in our abhorrence of at least one very common kind of compromise, which harmonizes the Bible and science or criticism by misinterpreting the Bible ; which gives up the universal Deluge of Genesis, but maintains the historical accuracy of the account when understood of a limited catastrophe ; which substitutes six creative periods for the six days of creation, and declares that, in the new version, Genesis and Geology are in perfect accord ; which interprets away the use of the Old Testament in the New, as accommodation, type, or allegory ; or tries to weaken to the utmost the force of the evidence it gives to the belief of the Apostles and of Christ himself. This rationalistic position is, in Mr. Huxley's words, "hopelessly untenable." We do not understand that this is the position of the authors of "*Lux Mundi*." But something like it is undoubtedly the position into which no inconsiderable part of the church has drifted. In fact, so far as scientific difficulties are concerned, it is now considered, curiously enough, to be highly orthodox ; while the difficulties of criticism having not yet made such an impression, the same kind of compromise with them is not thought quite sound. In our view the most dangerous symptom of the present theological situation is the readiness with which conservative men of all schools and parties yield one point after another at the summons of science or criticism. If that is to go on there will soon be nothing left. Men cannot always go on holding a principle and giving up its logical consequences ; and the devices by which they convince themselves that this is all right will not hold out forever. Temporizing compromises, whatever they may seem to offer, are the most costly sacrifices.

We think we have done full justice to Professor Huxley's vigorous and suggestive paper. We do not think that he does justice to the theologians, of whom surely there are some in England, whose attitude to these questions is wholly different from either Canon Liddon's confident dogmatism, or the timid compromises of a mediating theology. The Bible contains the primary sources for the study of a religion, or rather of two religions, which have been for many centuries intimately connected with human progress. The first task of the scientific theologian — we think Mr. Huxley would admit that there may be a scientific theologian — is to find out just what this collection of documents is. To this end he wants all the light he can get, from whatever source, and gladly avails himself of the help of physical science, historical criticism, the comparative study of religions, etc. When he has learned all he can about his sources, he sets himself, in the critical use of them, to study the history of the religion ; the origin and development of the ideas of God, and of man's duty and destiny, which have been so momentous a force in the world. Here he must employ, with double precaution, the historical method which has proved itself in other fields. Finally, he has, in the light of history, to distinguish the changing from the permanent in these ideas ; that which is incident to a given moment of the development or a certain historical

situation from the persistent principle; and to show in what relation these religious ideas stand to our knowledge and philosophy of the universe, on the one hand, and the theology of the church on the other. In all this his quest of truth need not be less single-minded, his method less stringent, because he believes, for himself, that in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself. For the conceptions which are the corollaries of that faith are not of such a character as to prejudice the inquiry.

That the outcome of this inquiry will be to undermine the foundations of Christianity would be a rash prophecy. The most revolutionary changes in the fundamental theory of a science do not destroy the science. We think it quite as reasonable to believe that all the enlargement and clearing up of our knowledge of the truth will establish our religion upon a firmer basis than ever.

---

#### LETTERS AND LIFE.

This Department of the "Review" is under the editorial care of Professor  
A. S. HARDY.

#### OPTIMISM IN AMERICAN LITERATURE AND LIFE.

THERE has been no more prominent or characteristic note in American Literature, from the first, than that of optimism. Longfellow, though for a time influenced by Heine in thought and in lyrical form, speedily found his life-long work as the utterer of "seven voices of sympathy;" the tender idyllist, and the poet of high resignation and serene endeavor. No sound of despair, or even of doubt, was mingled with the monotonous music of Bryant's verse. In Lowell's most stinging political satires, written in stormy days to correct an almost national sin, a sturdy faith in Americanism never wavered. Though the fierce and righteous zeal of Lowell and Whittier against slavery led them to label the fame of the greatest of modern orators with a premature epitaph, and though they, like other abolitionists of 1850, were somewhat hastily intolerant of that slow conservatism which, after all, finally saved the Union, neither of them has swerved, in the cooler blood of age, from a deep confidence in our destiny. Lowell found in the evolution of Lincoln's character the most interesting phenomenon of his time; and even Garfield's career led him hopefully to note the causes and conditions of our practical politics in a period of temptation. The list need not be lengthened: who does not know the beauty, already mentioned, of Whittier's sunshiny religious and political faith; the golden thread of liberty running through Motley's histories; Parkman's indication of the necessary triumph of Saxon ideas over French on the soil of the new world; the work of the unfaill-

ing line of mighty defenders of the nation in the political field, from Jefferson to Lincoln; the continuing growth of a self-respecting commonwealth after the appearance of the records of De Tocqueville, and in the very days when Bryce was writing his dispassionate survey? Our greatest romancer, our chief author of all, devoted his perennial books to the theme of the successful development of spiritual character on the field of life-struggle with sin; while the great Concord seer, in all his prose and verse, taught nothing but idealism, individualism, and the duty of learning the ethical lesson of the universe.

There is nothing new in the thought that we have no Schopenhauer or Tolstoi in our letters, and not many Machiavellis or Talleyrands in our life. The chorus of patriotic outcries has been long and loud, ever since 1776; and for many a year we were in more danger of splurge and half-concealed sensitiveness than of pessimism or even of decent modesty. But the very laudable and necessary efforts of earnest workers of late, to arouse our minds to the dangers of the money-power in politics, of sectional hate as a campaign weapon, of capitalistic greed, or of "nationalistic" or pension-list pauperism, are leading some hasty minds to fear that dry rot is destroying what foreign and internal war could not essentially diminish. There never has been a time, in this or any other country, when a "serious situation" did not confront the people. Buying office, fanning old coals of local strife, relying on the government as a panacea for all ills or as a limitless treasury for bummers and camp-followers and their descendants to the third generation, — these are evils which, like ward politics or our unparalleled problems of assimilation of immigration, must be met and patiently solved. But their solution is not aided by gloom. The men of 1776, of 1812, and of 1861, the makers of the nation, the framers and expounders of the Constitution, the builders of the New West, were successful because of their faith and not of their fears. Tremors belong to those who distrust themselves, and who never read history.

Perhaps the seemingly queer and unexpected wave of patriotism which is now sweeping over the country is a needed lesson for those who are misled by the sensational dailies and the satirical weeklies. Emerson used to remind us that to see the real nation we must leave the clubs and avenues and go to the town meetings. There is much more significance in the new flag lately set a-flying over the country schoolhouse than in the harmless and transient Anglomania visible here and there in the metropolitan park. The plain average heart and mind of the nation would rise as of yore were a new foreign or civil strife to call them forth. Courage and faith are not dead, but in reserve, — nay, their silent work is more effective than would be their conspicuous strife. As in our language dialects melt and disappear more rapidly than elsewhere in the world, so is our really enduring literature as homogeneously American — which is to say as optimistic — as ever. The anarchist and

the socialist, and the whimsical "nationalist" who tells the sentimental and the ignorant that Uncle Sam will give us all we want if we simply transfer everything to him, are dreadful spectacles, but their horrors are less suggestive than the sober glories of decent consolidation of heterogeneous elements under one flag. Mr. William O'Brien has been writing a book about the influence of American ideas on Ireland. We shall Americanize the Pope considerably before he Romanizes us. I lately saw, in a mining metropolis, Yankees, Pennsylvanians, Germans, Welsh, Hungarians, — men, women, and babes in arms, — celebrating the Fourth of July with a fervor and sensibleness not equaled for two decades. The men may still know nothing save their native patois, but the women will jabber in broken English, and the children are pretty sure to use their parent's dialect only as a filial condescension to ancestral limitations. Before they get to studying Colonel Balch's "Methods of Teaching Patriotism in the Public Schools," they will have well started, in a small way, their own methods of absorbing a national and patriotic optimism neither blind nor lazy, and of living on right lines as decent members of a body politic that is not going to die in a day, — even if high old Federalism, in its extremest form, revives occasionally as greenbackism, or socialism, or the silver-money craze, or nationalism, or the pension-grab.

"The true sovereigns of a country," said Dr. Channing sixty years ago, "are those who determine its mind, its mode of thinking, its tastes, and its principles;" and such determinants, however troublesome our case may be for the moment, are not the ward boss, the ballot-box stuffer, the vote-buyer, or even the editor of the vulgar and swollen daily newspaper which has too often usurped the place of its elders and betters of the golden age of American journalism. "As the blood of all nations is mingling with our own," says a character in Longfellow's "Kavanagh," "so will their thoughts and feelings finally mingle in our literature," — and, of course, in the life of which that literature is the exponent. I do not believe that the world-blood is deteriorating, and I am sure that the current in our national veins is as red and as true as ever.

*Charles F. Richardson.*

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, HANOVER, N. H.

---

## THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### A GENERAL VIEW OF MISSIONS. SECOND SERIES.

#### IX. CHINA.

WE begin our review with the year 1888, which opens with the remarks of the missionaries upon the unparalleled calamity resulting from the bursting of its banks by the Hoang-Ho (Hwang-Ho) or Yellow River. In our previous report we had alluded to it as being known from of old

as "China's Sorrow;" but we did not know how awful an illustration was soon to be afforded of the appropriateness of this title. The lowest estimate, we believe, puts the number of lives lost at two millions; the highest (which seems to be that of those who know the country best) at seven millions. On any estimate, it appears to be the most awful *recorded* calamity that has ever overtaken the human race since the Flood in a single stroke, and reduces to insignificance even the mighty wave which some thirty years ago carried off in one night two or three hundred thousand from the coast of Bengal.

Some, it is known, ascribe the epidemic that has been overspreading the world to the corruption of these innumerable multitudes of human bodies only partially covered by the alluvium of the great river. But it hardly agrees with this opinion that the Influenza is said to be only now breaking out in China, which therefore appears to be rather receiving than giving it, although it is said to be developing it into singular virulence. But plagues, wherever they may originate, cannot be kept out by any Exclusion Acts, and as China, just five centuries ago, sent forth the Black Death, to sweep off, it has been said, a full half of mankind, so we know not in what ghastly ways she may again be permitted to prove her solidarity with the rest of the human race.

The "Missionary Herald" for March, 1888, has an interesting article, from the Rev. J. H. Roberts, of Kalgan, on the Great Wall of China. Now that exploration is bringing so many ancient structures from the land of shadows into that of reality, it seems curious that it should be necessary to maintain by argument the existence of that structure which is in plain sight before everybody's eyes for hundreds of miles. But so it is. The Abbé Larrieu has crossed it lately, and yet affirms that there is no such thing. But as Mr. Roberts remarks, "This Wall is no more a myth than are the Pyramids of Egypt or the Bunker Hill Monument."

In the Nankou Pass, at a distance of thirty-seven miles from Peking, one first sees the Great Wall. "It asserts its individuality by stretching away on each side of the valley, up steep slopes, and from peak to peak, until it is lost to view at the top of those high and picturesque mountains. There in the pass is the view of the wall commonly given in books, impressing the imagination of the youth as he studies his geography. One sees at a glance what herculean efforts must have been put forth to raise so much brick and mortar to such heights, and build it there — a great work of national defense at the time, and a wonder for all subsequent ages to behold. A proverb says that 'building the Great Wall spoiled one generation, but saved a thousand.'

"The wall here is not much ruined, and has about the dimensions given in Williams's 'Middle Kingdom,' namely: twenty-five feet thick at base, fifteen feet thick at top, and from fifteen to thirty feet high. . . . If the weather is good, the wall almost gleams in the sunshine, extending like a light-gray ribbon along the ridge of the mountains, waving up and down, reaching from summit to summit, surmounted at its highest points by a square tower that stands out against the sky, defying wind and weather, as it once defied the Mongol hordes. The wall stretches away from Ch'a Tao to the southwest, and the eye can follow it for twenty or thirty miles, except where it crosses deep valleys or is hidden behind the nearer peaks. . . .

"But leaving the region above described, and going on to Kalgan, one reaches the more ancient branch of the Great Wall. There is the genuine wall erected by the haughty Emperor Ch'in Shih Huang, B. C. 21—

204. It is great in length and in antiquity, but not great in any other respect, except in the vast labor and expense and the number of lives it must have cost. The sight of it is disappointing. It is only about fifteen feet high, and twelve feet thick at the base. Its sides curve inward as they go up, and the ridge at the top is less than a foot thick, too thin in many places for a man to stand upon it without difficulty. It is built of irregular blocks of stone, dug out of the ground on the outer (that is, Mongolian) side, by which the level of the ground on that side was lowered, and the relative height of the wall increased. . . . From the mission premises of the American Board at Kalgan, the wall can be traced from a point five miles to the northwest, following the ridge of the mountains, to the northern end of the city, then climbing the side of Mount Williams to its peak (forty-five hundred feet above the sea, and eighteen hundred feet above Kalgan), and again following the ridge of the mountains away to a still higher peak called Mount Jacob, ten miles to the east. This ancient branch of the wall is much broken down, and in many places is merely a long heap of stones. But it can be identified at any place by the towers near it, and by its habit, so to speak, of following the divide, and of climbing the most inaccessible peaks."

Mr. Roberts, speaking of the newer part of the wall, near Peking, says, "At the foot of the mountains is a row of towers only about two hundred feet apart, which the eye can trace for a distance of nearly thirty miles, to a point where it enters a valley and is lost to sight among the mountains. These towers probably mark the line of an old military road occupied by the outposts of the soldiers who were defending the wall. Every third tower is faced with brick, and might have had a house built on the top of it, as some of them certainly had, in which, if necessary, sixty soldiers could live. Perhaps the Abbé Larrieu, who declares the Great Wall a myth, saw only these towers, and did not lift his eyes to the mountain tops. Or he may have ridden through the Pass in a mule litter, the windows of which are too low to give one a sight of the mountains. Or M. Larrieu may have been absorbed in reading a book. But how can he affirm from what he has *not* seen, that what many others *have* seen is a lie and a myth?" Mr. Roberts himself has traced and crossed the wall — in some places hardly traceable — at nine different points along a distance of two hundred and sixty miles.

Mr. Chapin, of the North China Mission, in the "*Missionary Herald*" for April, 1888, writes: "The work is indeed great. We open the chapel three evenings in the week, and it is soon filled. The last night I was there the listeners waited after I had closed speaking, and urged me most respectfully to go on preaching. I had the feeling that a sermon from three quarters of an hour to an hour in length was all that any company of Chinamen could digest at one time, but there was no resisting an invitation given so heartily. I went on.

"There is a constant stream of patients day after day, which will double, if not quadruple, when it becomes widely known that we dispense medicine. I hope that we may be able to make this agency serve directly for the spread of the gospel. At the same time we cannot give up the chapel preaching. Besides these two avenues of approach to the people is a third which will tax our time and patience; so soon as the building now being constructed is finished, there will be an unceasing swarm of visitors to see our courts. The Chinese are like children, very curious, and a foreign house — it is half foreign and half Chinese, a hybrid sort of structure — is a complete novelty. We cannot keep out these



people, without in some cases arousing suspicions which we desire to allay or prevent, and to show them about takes our time, with little apparent return in the way of preaching or forming friendships.

"Mr. Atwood has been besought by I know not how many to help them leave off the use of opium."

During the Week of Prayer in 1888 all the Peking churches divided themselves into two bands, inasmuch as no one chapel would hold all who wished to meet. About five hundred were present at the meetings.

Dr. Blodget reported the new translation, of which he revised Bishop Burdon's half of the New Testament, as "intelligible and grammatical throughout," and readily intelligible in all parts of the empire.

From Foochow Miss Hannah Woodhull writes: "I regard the masses of the Chinese as hating the Christian religion and foreigners as much as they have always done, and that the toleration which is exercised toward us is due to the fact that they have become convinced that we are harmless though misguided enthusiasts."

An article entitled "The Opportunity in China," written by Rev. C. A. Stanley, of Tientsin, and published in the "Missionary Herald" for September, 1888, very distinctly notes four great stages in the development of China:—

(1) The high ethical standard of her antiquity. "Instruction began with the child, who was taught to be sincere, truthful, honest, respectful to superiors, reverential to parents, always to conform to the 'rules of propriety in his conduct and deportment.' The same principles went with the lad into the schoolroom; the moral philosophy of the 'Great Sage'—'Equal of Heaven and Earth'—was the text-book of the aspirant for literary honors and official promotion, and by them he is supposed to regulate his life. It is a moral environment and influence from which no one can escape, vile and wicked though his life may be."

(2) The effect of this developed morality on the position of China among her neighbors. "Such was her position and development among the surrounding kingdoms that China's superiority soon became recognized, and she was an acknowledged teacher and leader among them. Her laws, culture, civilization, and 'Sacred Classics' became the model for the surrounding nations, and in some instances were adopted. This was especially true of her 'Classics.'"

(3) The unhappy reflex action of a preëminence so absolutely unquestioned. "The inevitable effect of all this on the nation must not be overlooked. Proud of her attainments, proud of being a teacher of others, she became haughty, conceited, arrogant, self-contained, and self-satisfied. Her doors of exclusion and inclusion were barred as well as closed. She looked with contempt on the little ignorant kingdoms fringing her borders, and thought she had no superior in all the earth. Thus she settled down contented, to pamper her conceit, to nourish her prejudices, to stagnate, and to decay."

(4) The revolution of opinion which, beginning in a reluctant acknowledgment of the mathematical and mechanical superiority of Christendom, is extending inevitably to wider and more vital concessions. "All this is undergoing change. The doors of the Celestial Empire have been thrust open and the nation has been aroused from its lethargic condition. She has been brought into intimate relations with the other great powers of the world, and has felt the impulse of their onward rush. She has been made to feel that their mushroom growth has outstripped her

hoary-headed wisdom. From despising, she has lifted her head to wonder and admire, and is now reaching out her hands and entering the path of progress. Pride and conceit are giving way, prejudice is being dispelled, confidence inspired, new desires, fresh impulses, a strange earnestness, and higher ambitions are finding a place in the thought of this old people. It is the same people, yet not the same."

"All this," Mr. Stanley well remarks, "is not Christianity, yet it is largely the result of Christianity. It could not have been if Christ had not come into the world."

Mr. Perkins, of the North China Mission, speaks of "the almost entire earthliness of the native mind, and its contentedness with a peaceable and industrious existence. The Chinaman does have one, and only one, belief about the future: 'The better we do here the better for us there, if there is a there.' This too scanty creed very generally satisfies the shriveled mind, and thus expediency becomes the highest standard, and of this every man is his own judge. Before any one resolves to perfect himself in materialism and agnosticism, let him visit China and see these twin systems in their perfection. He will find a narcotized nation. Neither have they any remedy for the deep paralysis. Hope and the courage of hope have run out through the gaps of unbelief."

The Rev. Jonathan Lees, of the London Mission, says, in an address quoted from in the "Missionary Herald" for December, 1888: "It was near the close of a winter afternoon, and my carter was pushing on to reach our halting-place for the night, when, on passing through a village, my eye was suddenly caught by what was evidently an extemporized temple mat-shed. Though pressed for time, curiosity led me to enter. Yes, there was the idol, a large picture hanging at the end opposite to the door, and there was the familiar altar table, with its incense pot, candlesticks, and various offerings, while the sides of the inclosure were made gay with pictures. A few old men were at the moment the only visitors. As I stood there a man came to burn incense and to perform his prostrations. Then we talked. You can imagine it easily enough. They told me that their worship was to secure good crops. I spoke of the great loving Father in heaven who supplies all our wants, and then I spoke of Jesus. Rising to go, they begged me to retell the story, and when at length I must leave, sad at heart that we might almost certainly never meet again on earth, one old, white-haired patriarch cried out: 'Oh, do stay and teach us. We did not know this was wrong. Our fathers worshiped thus; we cannot find the door.' Those words haunted me for many a day; they haunt me still."

Professor Seeley says that the quickening of the religious sense in the Roman Empire which resulted in the victory of the gospel was brought about by the enormous calamities which prevailed there. If tremendous calamities will break through the deep crust of Chinese secularism, we ought to see some results in the north. First, there was the famine which carried off some ten millions. Then the breaking out of the Yellow River with its undetermined millions of victims. Then came an alternation of drought and floods causing another, though as yet a lesser famine. A year ago six thickly populated provinces of the north were suffering heavily, great multitudes being reduced, as reported by Dr. Nevius, to live on "a grass which is like the sage-plant of the American table-lands . . . mixed with chaff, and made into a kind of cake, nearly tasteless and containing but little nutriment." Yet, it was said, *one cent a day*, besides what the people could do for themselves, would support

life. It was chiefly the field of the China Inland Mission that was thus afflicted.

The following proposition made to the London Missionary Society, by the Rev. Griffith John and the Rev. Arnold Foster, missionaries of the society in China, for a "Self-supporting Mission," in connection with the Society, seems to strike a very happy mean between the too rigid adherence to the elder missionary methods and a scattering individualism. We extract it from the "Missionary Herald." "These brethren express the opinion, as the result of long experience, that missionary salaries ought not to be reduced to the lowest possible point; that considerations of health and efficiency demand that missionaries should have something more than the bare necessities of life. But they believe that in England there are many men and women who can and ought to go out entirely self-supported, and they invite those who have an independent income, or whose personal friends are able and willing to support them, to form a band and come to China, where an unmarried man of frugal habits can live on five hundred dollars per annum, and a married couple on a thousand dollars per annum. They would have no one join this company who is supported by a church or a local auxiliary, but only those who have private sources of income sufficient to support themselves. This band they would have affiliated with the London Society, and subject to its general direction. These two brethren are able and ready to forego their salaries, and they propose to be members of the band, and they call earnestly for volunteers."

"Instances are continually occurring in China," says the "Missionary Herald," "showing how individuals who receive the gospel at some mission station return to their distant homes to become centres of evangelical influence. Several such cases we have reported recently. Another striking instance of this sort is reported by an English church missionary in the province of Cheh-kiang. A man named Tsong was cured of the habit of opium-smoking, at a hospital in Ningpo. While sitting in the dispensary he heard the gospel, and exclaimed at once, 'This is just what I want!' He seems to have accepted the offer of salvation instantly, and with his whole heart and soul. This was some two years ago. When he returned to his home he began to bear witness for Christ, and his kindred and neighbors received the message. In November last the missionary was summoned to examine thirty candidates for baptism."

Mr. Winchester, of the North China Mission, writing of a preaching visit to a certain village, says: "Before our bedding was removed from the cart, the richest man in the village came, supported by a few others, and invited us over to his store to drink tea. When we were seated with the inevitable cup of tea in hand, looking round upon the promiscuous crowd — men, boys, and even women — who occupied every inch of standing room in the small reception chamber where we sat, in the store beyond, and for a wide space around the door outside, I could not help seeing the resemblance to that picture in Mark ii. 2, and remarked to Mr. Pierson how easy it was, looking upon this scene, to account for Christ's presence as a teacher in the house of such an one as Simon, and also for the presence of the woman that was a sinner in the house of one that despised her. I think that everywhere in the Orient teachers are thus honored and the common people thus privileged. Mr. Pierson at once took that as a text, and 'preached Jesus' to them."

Mr. Thompson, of the Shansi Mission, writes: "One day when I was

resting for a few minutes in a temple in one of the villages, some of the people who followed me in asked me what I thought of the images. While I was trying to tell them how helpless such things were, one of the men said, 'Yes, we placed these images here many years ago, and up to the present time they have never been able to walk out of doors.' At another village some young gentlemen came and asked to have the doctrine explained to them. At another place I saw numbers of men enter the temple, worship the idols, and then smoke their opium, till presently the floors of the temple buildings were covered with the slumbering victims of this terrible habit. Poor creatures! how sadly their lot comments on the abused power of a Christian nation! Is it not also a sad comment on the powerlessness of heathenism?"

The "Missionary Herald" for September last remarks: "The advantages that would come to China from the building of railways are well set forth by a writer in 'The Contemporary Review' for May. The only motive that will overcome the national opposition to this innovation will be the conviction on the part of China's wisest statesmen that the railroad is necessary as a national defense. Among the incidental results will be the cheapening of food, the impetus to agriculture, the prevention of famine, and the overcoming of numberless superstitions. The famines that have desolated various sections of the empire have always been local in their extent, and the difficulty of transporting sufficient supplies from the productive provinces has been the cause of the deplorable suffering which these famines have caused. Railroads would remedy all this. It is said that a Chinaman, as a rule, lives and is buried within a few miles of the place of his birth, and naturally he becomes narrow and exclusive, and hence unsympathetic. The coming of railroads would reduce the number of dialects in use; would compel a reform in currency, and the adoption of a foreign standard of time. It seems to be the wedge which will break the rock of Chinese exclusiveness and open the empire to the introduction of modern civilization."

The "Herald," for November, 1889, mentions a curious superstition of the Chinese, which may possibly, unless things change, abridge the reign of the present youthful emperor, Kwang-su. It is, that to each human being the Fates allot a certain amount of earthly good. He may, by prudent self-restraint, extend it over many years, or he may squander it recklessly and soon. The Rev. Mr. Farthing, an English missionary in Shansi, informs us that some Chinamen are beginning to remark that the floods, famines, and manifold disasters of the present reign begin to indicate that the present sovereign has already exhausted his stock of felicity, and had better retire. Probably, however, the people will conclude that so long as Heaven suffers the Mantchu dynasty to reign over them, the particular prince signifies little. They have, it is true, no other doctrine of divine right in the sovereign than that he shall discharge his functions beneficially. Failing in that (even, we suppose, from misfortune), he becomes, as Chinese philosophy wisely declares, "the lightest thing in the whole social system."

Rev. H. D. Porter, M. D., of North China, in the "Missionary Herald," for December, 1889, supplies a very interesting article, of which we extract a large part, entitled, "China; Her New Railway and her Great Men." "It may be of interest," he says, "to call attention to the several officials who represent the modern movement and determine its character. The Prince Chun, father of the emperor, head of the Foreign Office, chief of the Board of Admiralty, was once bitterly hostile,

but since the French War of 1884, aroused to the new needs of his vast empire, and though an invalid, is devising ways to secure to his enthroned son that 'Brilliant Succession' which the imperial title implies. The Marquis Tsêng, distinguished by eight years of remarkable experience in diplomacy in England and on the Continent, is now a member of the Foreign Office, and second on the Board of Admiralty. The son of the most famous Chinaman of the past generation, he carries into his new duties the weight of a great name and of individual ability. By his influence he has opened up to competitive examination mathematics and physical science, on a par with the ancient and isolating Confucian classics.

"Next to these nominal guides to the new progress, the task of planning and carrying into detail is committed to two men who are already widely known as of remarkable personal force and commanding ability. The two are Li Hung Chang in the north, and Chang Chi Tung, recently transferred from Canton to Han-kow for the express purpose of executing his own memorial advising the building of this line of road. Of the Viceroy Li, it is unnecessary to say more than to recall the fact of his having been for eighteen years the great commanding force at Tientsin, under whose wise and powerful guidance armies and navies, arsenals and technical schools, mines and railroads, diplomacies and philanthropies, have been developed and fostered. The providences by which this man has been led will appear still more noticeable when his biography, by a distinguished American scholar in the consular service, shall have been given to the world in two large volumes. To Viceroy Li has been intrusted the equipment and building of the northern half of the new railway.

"Chang Chih Tung, author of the memorial accepted by the government, recently appointed to build and equip the southern half of the new road, is not so well known abroad, but is greatly distinguished in China. From the point of modern progress it may well appear providential. 'A phenix nest' is the proverbial Chinese name for any place which is the birthplace of great scholars or officials. The home of the Chang family has sent forth five noticeable officials within a quarter of a century, one of them being a member of the Foreign Office. Chang Chih Tung rose to importance in 1875, very suddenly, from the scholarly position of the censorate at Peking. By a fiercely patriotic and scathing denunciation of Chung How, then minister to Russia, whose treaty of Livadia was deservedly decried, Chang gained a wide reputation. He was at once made governor of Shansi. His advent there was signalized by remarkable vigor in numberless reforms, especially in attempts to control the terrible opium scourge. The famine of 1878 brought him into intercourse with the missionary work. At his instigation a monument was erected to Rev. Albert Whiting, who died of famine fever at Tai-yuan-fu. There also he became greatly interested in Western medicine, machinery, and physical appliances. So acceptable had been his vigorous administration that the government transferred him to the viceroyalty of Canton, second only in importance to that of Tientsin itself. His career has been signalized by great patriotism and remarkable vigor of administration. His attacks upon the anti-Chinese American policy have given some special interest to his name for all Americans in China."

The death of the Marquis Tsêng, at the early age of forty-two, is a sad loss to his country. A very warm tribute to his intellectual and moral

worth, by Dr. Doremus Scudder, has appeared in the "Advance" of July 17th, 1890.

"The Church at Home and Abroad," the organ of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, says, in its number for January, 1888: "We must stop for a moment first at Hainan, the great island which lies off the southern shore of China. Five years ago literally a *terra incognita*, it has since been explored and revealed to the world, with its million inhabitants, by the missionaries of Canton, Messrs. Jeremiassen and Henry. It is the last of the principal fields which have been occupied by the Board. The first missionaries are, with the exception of Mr. Jeremiassen, scarcely more than learning the language as yet, but especially through medical labors they are making their first gains in the confidence and gratitude of the people. An epidemic breaking out among the Chinese troops, Drs. Jeremiassen and McCandlish devoted themselves to their relief, and won the goodwill and thanks of great numbers on the spot. In two months Dr. McCandlish reports the coming of three thousand persons for medical treatment, to all of whom the gospel was taught by Dr. Jeremiassen. There has come in later letters news of some change in the spirit of the authorities, a wave, no doubt of suspicion. But plainly the mission in Hainan has passed already its initial stage. The missionaries are *at home* there. It is evident that they can stay, and that they can work. At last, after nearly nineteen hundred years, the pure gospel of Christ has reached far-off and almost forgotten Hainan. The morning has dawned!"

Archdeacon Moule, quoted from the "Church Missionary Intelligencer" by the Presbyterian magazine, says of the lately deceased widow of Bishop Russell of Ningpo: "She was married and entered upon her work in 1852. After the death of her husband, she continued at her post, completing a labor of thirty-five years." And he adds, "Oh, how we shall miss her! A link with the long-gone past; a loving sympathizer with the newest recruit; loving and sympathizing with the Chinese; one who, without Chinese dress or food or house, was, I believe, nearer to the Chinese heart than almost any one in China; a perfect speaker of the colloquial, and with a minute knowledge of the customs of the people; possessing, above all, an all-conquering desire to make the beloved name of her Saviour known and loved." The "Church at Home and Abroad" quotes this description, very pertinently, for an answer to the question whether missionaries' wives are to be accounted missionaries. Mrs. Russell, like the bishop's wife who has just passed away in the northwest, abundantly deserved the title "episcopa" which was often given of old.

We are accustomed to think of China as so populous that it is running over from its very fullness. But the "North China Herald," it appears, regards the country as being very far from this point. "The official tables recently published give a grand total of about 392,000,000 as the population of the country. This does not include dependent countries, such as Thibet and Korea. According to the revenue returns between 1760 and 1848, it would seem that the population increased at the rate of about 2,500,000 a year.

"The causes of increase," says the Shanghai writer, 'are always at work. They are the thoroughness of agriculture, the fertility of the soil, the anxiety of parents to see their sons married by the time they are eighteen, the willingness of the women to be married about seven-



teen, the equality of the sons as heirs to property, the thrift habits of the people, and their adaptability to a variety of occupations requiring skill and industry.' The conclusion at which he arrives is that none of the provinces are populated up to the point at which the soil cannot maintain the inhabitants. When drought and war occur, the people fly to the next province. The provinces take their turn in being thickly or thinly populated, and with new aids against famines and civil wars they might, it would seem, support 800,000,000 without much difficulty." This extract is quoted by the American magazine from "The Missionary Herald of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland."

The Rev. James Webster, one of the best known of the missionaries of the English United Presbyterian Church, in Manchuria, had, in 1887, been paying a visit to the chief missionary centres of North China. These are largely in the two northeastern provinces of Shantung, which juts out into the ocean, and Chili, in which lies the capital. Mr. Webster says: "Fifty years ago not a missionary from any Protestant church in the world was found in this region. Two years before the queen began her reign an American brig, with Medhurst on board, landed off the Shantung promontory, and waited while that devoted Christian missionary distributed books, and spoke to the people on shore, who were, like many still in out-of-the-way places where foreigners are utterly unknown, awed and petrified with amazement at the appearance of the strangers. Now there are scores of devoted men and women from the evangelical churches of England and America not only visiting, but living from year to year among the people; hundreds of thousands of Christian books have been scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land; schools and colleges have been opened, dispensaries and hospitals have been built, and untold thousands have been healed of their diseases. The old suspicion and prejudice have to a large extent passed away. The story of the cross has penetrated into almost every city and hamlet throughout the two provinces. Small companies of believers are to be found here and there, — in the city, in the busy market town, or in the quiet country village. Many thousands have entered the portals of the Christian church, and many more are believers in secret."

The notion that idolatry is dying in China, or in India, is sufficiently refuted by facts. Rev. G. F. Fitch, of the Presbyterian mission in Ningpo, writing December 8, 1887, says: —

"The city temple of Ningpo was reopened last Sunday, having recently received extensive repairs, to the extent, it is said, of some fifty thousand dollars. The carving, gilding, painting, and decorating are beyond anything I have yet witnessed. These, taken with the crowd of worshipers which throng the place day after day from morning until evening, are sufficient to convince one that idolatry is not yet dead. I took our consul and his wife and daughter to visit the place a few days ago, and through the courtesy of a Chinese friend, we were shown the bedrooms of the gods — two rooms most expensively furnished with carved and inlaid bedsteads, large foreign mirrors, clocks, wash-stands, wardrobes, etc. Most of it was rented, I presume, for the occasion. So far from the people seeming to be moved by the scourge of pestilence the last summer, they are more 'mad upon their idols' than ever before."

It has slowly come to be understood, that the gospel did not prevail in the Roman Empire during a time of religious indifference, but during ages when the religious sensibilities of mankind were raised to their

highest pitch. The elder religions, and the newly imported ones, were never more magnificently maintained, or more devoutly followed. It was because this full final trial was made of their capacity to satisfy the spirit of man, that Christianity was able to offer itself with confidence in their stead. If, as some have thought, a national revival of religion is beginning to make itself felt in China, it is a far more hopeful sign for missions than if the Chinese remained steeped in secularism, varied only by vulgar superstitions.

The "Church at Home and Abroad" for January, 1889, remarks that the viceroy of the province of Canton, whose authority also extends over the great island of Hainan, continues a course of petty persecution, which seriously embarrasses the work. Our policy towards the Chinese, it appears, is arousing no small resentment, and this supports him in his course of retaliation.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States has four missions in China: CANTON, with four main stations, Canton, Macao, Hainan, and Yeung Kong; PEKIN; SHANTUNG, with the main stations of Tungchow, Chefoo, Chenanfoo, and Wei Hien; CENTRAL, with the main stations of Ningpo, Shanghai, Hangchow, Suchow, and Nanking.

Attention appears to be drawn more and more to the China Inland Mission. It seems to have made a very deep impression on our continental Protestant brethren, judging from the extended references to it in many of their magazines, although the "Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift," which is decidedly, and even belligerently, in favor of the established missionary methods, is hardly included among these. A deliberate opinion by the Presbyterian Church would be of special value, on account of the conservative sobriety of judgment which would be apt to distinguish it. We are peculiarly gratified, therefore, to find in the "Church at Home and Abroad," for February, 1889, a full and careful description, by Dr. Arthur Mitchell himself, of the China Inland Mission, conceived in a tone of sober, but decided sympathy and commendation. The present writer, for himself, would hardly hesitate to say, *Roma locuta est: causa finita est*. We give the whole of Dr. Mitchell's article, being convinced that we have here to do with the dawn of methods which are coming rapidly to the front in missionary work, involving grave dangers and inestimable blessings, and that we shall not soon have an opportunity to interpret them under a sounder guidance.

"The history of the China Inland Mission ought to be studied by all Christians. They may not be convinced that the methods followed by this mission are the only methods for the evangelization of the world and its permanent conquest in Jesus' name, but they will certainly see in the history of this simple organization wonderful instances of direct strong faith in God, with striking answers to prayer. The results of the mission's twenty-two years of work cannot yet be fairly measured. Some might be inclined to call them small, — that portion which is now visible, — but there would be much danger of error if we did not remind ourselves that this is still a new society, laboring in new fields, and that there are signs of an influence proceeding from it which reaches very far. Perhaps it is, thus far, more powerful as an influence than as an agency.

#### "WHAT ARE ITS PRINCIPLES?"

"This mission began twenty-two years ago. On the 26th of May, 1866, Rev. J. Hudson Taylor sailed from London in the 'Lammermuir'

with seventeen other missionaries to open their work in China. The principles on which they proposed to conduct missions are stated briefly by a friendly pen: 'They determined, in entire dependence upon divine support and protection, to attempt to make their way *inland*. They would cast themselves upon God for resources; soliciting nothing from the public, guaranteeing no income to their agents, incurring no debts, but just doing what from time to time they found they had the means to attempt.'

"When it is said that they would solicit nothing from the public, reference is made to *personal* solicitation. 'Occasional papers' are sent out stating the needs of the work, and for some years past a magazine, 'China's Millions,' has been issued, which bears much resemblance to other missionary magazines, although marked by its concentration on one great field. All funds received are there acknowledged, but the names of donors, whether they be churches or individuals, are never given.

"Considering that it would be possible, in a simple evangelistic work, for members of various denominations to labor harmoniously side by side, without interference with points of conscience, they concluded to invite the coöperation of fellow-believers, irrespective of denomination, who fully believed in the inspiration of God's word, and were willing to prove their faith by going into inland China with only the guarantees [for financial support] which they carried within the covers of their pocket Bibles.'

"They determined also to give great prominence to itineration. Mr. Taylor has recently said, 'The command to evangelize, to go into all the world to preach the gospel to every creature, and the examples recorded in the New Testament of the methods of the early workers, might have led us from the first to give itineration an even greater prominence than we did. It must be admitted that stations become necessary to some extent; the itinerant work of the church cannot be carried on without them. It is, however, a grave mistake to make location our first aim, instead of keeping it in a strictly subordinate position as an auxiliary.

"The narratives of the mission read like a continuation of George Müller's well-known history of the Bristol Orphanage. Specific, united, and abundant prayer for everything which is needed is the keynote of the magazine, and the cornerstone of the work which it describes. 'Be careful for nothing, be prayerful for everything.'

#### "THE MOVEMENT INLAND.

"When Mr. Taylor and his companions set sail from London in 1866, there were only about a hundred missionaries, of all societies, in China. Almost all of these were in the six provinces on the coast. Hu-peh was, we believe, the only other province in which there was a resident missionary. In the eleven interior provinces, with the exception of one point in Kiang-si, there were no stations at all.

"It illustrates the devout character of this group of missionaries, that the ship on which they sailed, the 'Lammermuir,' witnessed revival scenes on the voyage. The officers and crew numbered thirty-four. Twenty-one of them confessed Christ before reaching Java.

"On the 30th of September the ship anchored at Shanghai. In a few weeks the missionaries pushed up the river in boats. A thousand obstacles showed themselves. At Hangchau, however, a young American missionary gave a part of the company shelter for a few days in his

dwelling. Evidently it was no disadvantage that older societies had preceded them. But they soon had a house of their own, the first headquarters of the mission in China. At that time foreigners had no right to reside inland or to travel with passports. It was not practicable to obtain passports until after the Chefoo conference. Yet in *eight years* the work of the mission had spread to a number of unoccupied cities in the provinces of Kiang-Su and Cheh-Kiang, and to two of the eleven unoccupied provinces which, as Mr. Taylor writes, 'were specially upon our hearts when the mission was formed.' The missionaries at this time numbered fifty-two, including wives of missionaries. In two of the 'unoccupied' provinces fifty-two stations and out-stations had been opened, and native assistants to the number of seventy, including Bible-women, were at work.

"NEW PRAYERS AND NEW GROWTHS.

"The missionaries and their friends in England now united in earnest prayer for a notable increase of their force. They prayed that eighteen new laborers might be given within the next year. The eighteen were given. This was in 1876. The new comers were just ready for work when the Chefoo convention, signed by Li Hung Ch'ang, 'opened the doors more widely than ever before to inland China.' In November, 1881, at a conference of the mission at Wu-Ch'ang, it was determined to unite in asking of God seventy additional missionaries within three years. The first letter concerning this special prayer was published in London in March, 1882. 'We prepared,' says Mr. Taylor, 'an appeal for prayer, and circulated it among the members of the mission for the signatures of those who would undertake to *pray daily* for "the seventy." This appeal, with the facsimile of seventy-seven signatures, was subsequently printed in 'China's Millions.' In the appeal, after a reference to the need of China, we pleaded with the churches of God at home and abroad.

"I. To unite with us in fervent, effectual prayer that God would thrust forth more laborers into his harvest in connection with every Protestant missionary society, on both sides of the Atlantic.

"II. To join with our praying band in entreating the Lord of the harvest to thrust forth this "other seventy also" for the China Inland Mission.'

"What was the result? Instead of the seventy, there were eighty who sailed for China before the close of 1884. Of these, fifty were women, most of them unmarried. In 1885 forty more offered themselves, and were accepted as missionaries and sent. All needful funds for the outfit, passage, and support of these new missionaries were also given, while 'the older workers were better supplied than before, long journeys taken, and the various extensions needed (the opening of some new stations and the obtaining of additional premises) were made as required.'

"The year 1887 was marked by even more inspiring answers to prayer. A hundred additional missionaries were asked of God. Before 1887 closed, a hundred had been accepted and had sailed. Successive parties had arrived in China, and at the training-schools of the mission had commenced the study of the language; the men at Gan-K'ing; the women, of whom there were fifty-three, nearly all unmarried, at Yang-chau.

"Meantime the income of the mission, which in 1886 was £22,000,

rose in 1887 to £33,700, or about \$170,000. Concerning this large increase Mr. Taylor writes: 'When we began to pray in China we thought that £10,000 additional might be needed, and asked the Lord to supply it in large gifts. It was very delightful to see the answer in large unsolicited gifts, so that during the year eleven contributions — the smallest of which was £500 and the largest of which was £2,500 — did supply £10,000 of that £33,717 11s. 3d. No man was asked for a penny; the Lord was asked and He inclined the hearts of his people to give.' Here, again, Mr. Taylor can only mean that there was no *personal* solicitation; but their plans and wants were fully made known.

"THE LATEST STATISTICS.

"The work of the mission has now extended to fifteen provinces. There are 66 organized churches. 'The staff of the mission numbers 294,' comprising, apparently, 56 missionaries who are married, 169 unmarried missionaries, and 13 'associates.' There are also 132 native helpers. In ten out of the eleven provinces, where previously there was no Protestant missionary, stations have been opened, and it is to be hoped that one will ere long be established in the eleventh, which has been several times visited. Altogether, the stations number 129. More than 3,000 persons have been received into church fellowship, and the number at present in communion is about 2,105. Last May it was estimated that 4,000 souls had been converted. 'In fourteen of the fifteen provinces, at sixty-four stations, there are *resident* missionaries. The out-stations number 65; the chapels where there is stated preaching, 110; ordained native pastors, 12; native preachers, 49; native helpers of various kinds, Bible-women, colporteurs, chapel-keepers, 132. A large number of these, from twenty to thirty, are wholly or mostly self-supporting or supported by the native Christians. There are 18 schools in the mission, with 174 scholars, three hospitals, five dispensaries, and 16 opium refuges. The medical missionaries number ten.

"PECULIARITIES OF THE MISSION — LAYMEN — ITINERATION.

"It will be seen that in many respects the methods of the China Inland Mission resemble those which the older missionary societies have employed; while there are also in its work many peculiar features.

"The mission has sent out far more laymen than ordained ministers, and the standard of education among them is lower than among the missionaries, for example, of the Presbyterian Board. But it should be said that great care is exercised in selecting the missionaries, and afterwards of training them in China. Much of the work which has been done by our missionaries, and which is absolutely indispensable to the Christianization of China, the Inland Mission has hardly attempted. There is room, however, for many forms of work in that wide and needy land.

"The Inland Mission is, we believe, largely composed of Premillennarians. Naturally, therefore, as observed above, it lays the emphasis on *itineration*, on preaching the message of salvation over a wide area and doing this rapidly. The difference is one in emphasis only; for all evangelical societies have it as a true part of their plan to do the same thing. Many of the latter, however, give more attention to the formation of Christian *institutions*. These, even if they are not so immediately effective as evangelistic agencies, which we are not prepared to

admit in all cases, will, it is believed, produce a wider harvest, albeit a somewhat later one, of native power and well-rooted life. Hence such societies have tenfold more schools of every grade, embracing in some cases a range of study partly collegiate in its character, and including thorough theological instruction, while in lower schools they are in some fields raising up almost a nation of readers. Corresponding to this work of education, the older societies are carrying forward also a literary work which has no parallel in the China Inland Mission. These brethren found the Bible already translated and ready for the millions around them, a large body of grammatical and lexicographical helps, also, ready for their own use in the acquisition of the language, a whole line of schoolbooks for their scholars, in both common and higher schools, Biblical and theological treasures prepared by earlier missionaries through patient years, with a Christian literature of unspeakable value, and medical treatises, all of which they could place at once in the hands of their students and helpers.

"THE MANY UNMARRIED MISSIONARIES—ADOPTING THE CHINESE  
MODE OF LIFE.

"It is a further peculiarity of the China Inland Mission that a very large proportion of the men in its ranks are unmarried. The proportion of unmarried to married women is still larger. In fact, the number of *families* in the mission is small. Of the 102 missionaries sent in 1887, 43 were men and 59 were women. Of the women, 54 were unmarried. The care of mothers and of children is therefore to a great degree eliminated from their expenditures and from their thoughts. This is a point to be noticed. It in part explains the fact of the large number of missionaries who are sustained on the comparatively limited income of the mission. Whether so large a proportion of unmarried missionaries is desirable is a question concerning which there have long been and will continue to be diverse views.

"The missionaries of the Inland Mission, we believe, generally adopt the native costume. They also live in native houses, which have undergone a few alterations. They accustom themselves in great measure to the whole style of life among the natives of China, making it their aim as far as possible to lose their foreign aspect. This involves frequently no little discomfort. They do not speak of it as hardship, but hardship it would certainly be to many delicate persons, involving serious peril, to adopt the diet of the natives, to sleep on their brick beds, to expose themselves to the evil odors, the sickening air, and the vermin which we presume must accompany any very close contact with the life of the poorer classes in China. These missionaries claim that the measures above described, especially as to their dress, allay a noisy and troublesome curiosity with which they are regarded. On the other hand, some of our own missionaries tell us that an effect the very reverse of this is produced by a foreigner's adopting the native costume; that it awakens often peculiar derision. There is, however, no doubt that by all the methods referred to above the Inland missionaries are able to reduce the cost of living to half that which other missionaries usually incur. The acceptance of such sacrifices and hardships by missionaries, at what they regard as a call of God, is a noble act. It betokens a high standard of consecration to their Saviour's cause. In some kinds of work it is indispensable. We



cannot doubt, however, that many missionaries who have followed the ordinary ways in the matters referred to have served God as unselfishly, and, through their family life especially, have wrought a good work, without which the picture of Christian life presented to the heathen, and the influences brought to bear on them, would have been very incomplete, perhaps misleading.

"NO SALARIES GUARANTEED."

"It is one of the most noticeable peculiarities of the China Inland Mission that, as we have already pointed out, it guarantees no salary whatever to the missionaries. Whatever funds reach the treasury through the means which we have mentioned above are equitably divided, each missionary receiving his share. If the amount is sufficient for their comfort, they take it and give thanks to God; if it is insufficient, they suffer. That in some stages, at least, of the mission's history suffering, sharp and long, has been encountered, is unquestioned. All honor to the brave men and women who are willing, if it may be necessary, to endure this! but the church at home, laden with riches, cannot ask it, should be ashamed to allow it."

Dr. Mitchell has laid the church and the missionary work under great obligations by this detailed and sympathetic, and at the same time judicially critical account of this the most eminent incorporation of the new methods, as contrasted with the elder ones. Much is to come out of them, undoubtedly, especially after their first crudeness is corrected.

It may be remarked, that the ascetic features in this mission only result casually from motives of greater efficiency, and are not to be confounded with the intended asceticism of some of the Anglo-Catholic missionaries in India. China, indeed, is not the land of asceticism. Such an awakening of the spiritual sense as would bring it a little nearer to India in this regard would perhaps be a hopeful sign.

In our next paper we purpose giving a report of the great missionary conference held last May in Shanghai, of which we have an interesting account from Dr. Porter in the "Advance."

Charles C. Starbuck.

ANDOVER.

---

### GERMAN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

*Handbuch der Politischen Ökonomie*, herausgegeben von Dr. Gustav Schönberg, ord. Professor der Staatswissenschaften an der Universität Tübingen. Dritte Auflage. Drei Teile in drei Bänden. Erster Band: Volkswirtschaftsleben. Erster Teil, pp. xvi, 790, Lex-Oktav. Verlag der H. Laupp'schen Buchhandlung in Tübingen. Broch. Mrk. 15, Halbfrzbd. Mrk. 17.40. — The inability of what is called political economy to confine itself to a segment of the social circle and complete itself independently of neighboring disciplines has given rise to a division of labor and a harmonious coöperation under the able management of Dr. Schönberg that places every student of social and political science under obligation to this comprehensive "Handbook of Political Economy." The

VOL. XIII. — NO. 81.

22

complete work is a product of twenty-two writers, each a specialist in the department which he represents. The necessity of such coöperation, in order that the entire body of the science may hold itself in the present, is apparent when we remember that the first volume of the great work of Roscher is entering its twentieth edition, while the fifth and last volume has not yet appeared. The success of this coöperative plan is sufficiently attested by the call for the third edition of this large and expensive work within eight years of its first appearance. The volume before us shows a decided improvement upon its second edition. It is more systematic in its arrangement, while the introduction of a new chapter, pages 723-783, on Population, makes the volume more complete, and does homage to the growing conviction that the problems of population are not only fundamental, but lie at the very entrance of sociological study. Of the thirteen divisions which constitute the present volume, we may note as of special importance to the student of social science, "Economics," by Professor Schönberg, "Political Economy as Science" and "Socialism and Communism," by Professor Von Scheel, "Economic Principles," by Professor Neumann, and the "Doctrine of Population," by Professor Von Rümelin. In the body of the work, pages 175-722, Production, Price, Measure and Weight, Money and Coinage, Credit and Banking, Transportation and Communication, Distribution and Consumption, are discussed in as many chapters. The work of Professor Adolph Wagner on "Credit and Banking" is regarded as a masterpiece. The Handbook, though representing what is loosely called the German historical school, is not made in the interest of any party, but has to do solely with a comprehensive sociology in which the experiences of mankind are the most important elements. Thus ethical and jural principles find both a place and an exposition in the treatment of various problems. The labor question is not treated merely as a matter of bald economics, but is regarded in its moral, political, and religious aspects. We have seen no work which forms so good an introduction to the problems concerning the relation of the individual to the community and the functions of the state. As a Handbook of the subject matter and literature the work is invaluable. The second and third volumes are already in press. Each volume is furnished with an index of its matter, and the last with a complete index of the whole work.

*Buddha. Sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde.* Von Hermann Oldenberg. Zweite Auflage. Pp. xii, 420. Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz (Bessersche Buchhandlung). Mrk 9. — "Das vortreffliche Buch von H. Oldenberg" is a familiar phrase to readers of recent German books which have occasion to refer to Buddhism. The work is undoubtedly the first authority on the general subject. More recent and complete than the excellent Manual of Rhys Davids, it is also regarded as more cautious and exact than the late contribution by Monier-Williams. Many of the parallels, drawn by enthusiasm, between Christ and Buddha grow flimsy or vanish completely on a more thorough knowledge of the men and their doctrines. Buddhism in its purity is a philosophy rather than a religion. As such it appealed to the sons of noble families, to those who could give their lives to working out its scheme of knowledge, rather than to all sorts and conditions of men. So far as is known, there is not a single mention, in the ancient texts, of pariah membership in the order. Buddha's metaphysical theory is the essence of

his entire system. The right understanding of the fourfold truth and a faithful adherence to the eightfold way bring the disciple into Nirvana, or subjective peace and freedom. The deep and fundamental pessimism upon which Buddhism is founded is relieved by the prospect of self-emancipation and by a high ethical code, but this last is practically invalidated through extreme ascetic prescriptions. In the Introduction is given an excellent presentation of Indian pantheism and pessimism before the time of Buddha. The first division of the work, pages 74-220, gives the life of Buddha. "The Doctrines of Buddhism" form the subject of the second part. It is needless to say that this is a field into which the present-day theologian and philosopher must enter. The final chapter is a study of the Buddhistic community. The present edition of Professor Oldenberg's work gathers up the fruits of recent progress in the study of Buddhism made through the labors of the Pāli Text Society, of Cowell, Neil, and above all of E. Senart, whose notable contribution, "Revue des Deux Mondes," March 1, 1889, is carefully considered.

*Blicke in vergessene Winkel, Geschichts-Kulturstudien und Character-bilder.* Ein Beitrag zur Volkskunde von Max Ebeling. Zwei Bände. Pp. iii, 217; iv, 332. Leipzig: Verlag von Georg Böhme, Nachf. E. Ungleich. — The writer of these volumes is impressed with the general truth that the peasantry of a nation does not receive its just share of recognition in the building and preservation of national institutions. To show how "the common people" are the vital and rejuvenating power in history, and how great an extent the sources of history are in the life of the peasantry, the author takes up the story of the Drömlings, following them through nineteen hundred years in their various moral, political, and religious experiences and services. The first volume is concerned chiefly with their history, the second with their manners, customs, beliefs, and institutions. The work combines the interest of romance with the history of a most remarkable people, and is a most valuable contribution to Folk-Lore as well as to the inner life of the German people through the larger range of their history. The work has a special value with reference to early Christianity and the evangelization of Germany as well as with reference to Reformation times.

*Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, entworfen von Eduard Reuss. Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Ausgabe. Pp. xx, 780. Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn. Mrk. 15. — First outlined as a course of university lectures in 1834, this work is the product of more than a half century's study. It has already taken its position in the first rank of Old Testament literature, and is justly regarded as an indispensable aid to Old Testament study. The work is carried out from the standpoint of the Law. It is from this position that the large field may be best surveyed and understood. The four books into which the work is divided correspond to the four great periods of Old Testament history. The Heroic age, pages 34-191, shows a crude people working its way to a higher plane through strong individualism. The Prophetic age, growing out of the former, brings into prominence a well-ordered, self-conscious national life permeated by spiritual and religious impulses. The Sacerdotal age, pages 416-608, is marked by the triumph and rule of these religious impulses, which finally crystallize into those ideas which make up the body of formalism. The Theological age, which forms the closing period of Old Testament history and establishes the power of the

Theologians, is a phase, the completion of which is to be sought outside and beyond the boundaries of Judaism. In attaining to this point Judaism reached its goal and served its highest purpose. These four periods may be characterized by the terms, Individualism, Idealism, Formalism, and Traditionalism, or, the nation as subject, revelation as means, worship as form, and law as effect. In speaking of the improvements in the present edition of his work Professor Reuss finds occasion for reflection on the chaotic condition of Old Testament criticism and on the shortcomings of reviewers. The spirit of haste and the shiftlessness of judgment account for much prevailing confusion. The intuitive method has certain disadvantages in criticism and reviews. As a history, the work of Professor Reuss is a compact, consecutive, and clear presentation of the entire life and literature of the Old Testament. But it is more than a history, inasmuch as it involves the literature and philosophy of a history. It is, in the best sense, a complete Handbook of the history and literature, political, moral, and religious, of the Old Testament.

*Mattoon M. Curtis.*

BAD LIEBENSTEIN.

